THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutatory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXX.—APRIL, 1905—No. 118.

THE EDUCATIONAL FACT.

IT IS nearly twenty-three centuries since the master mind of antiquity attempted to establish the principles and to sketch a plan of the training that, from the viewpoint of the highest pagan wisdom, was adapted to the formation of an ideal citizen. Since Plato's day much rhetoric and writing material have been expended on the question of education. Writers of various degrees of intelligence and scholastic experience have occupied themselves in defining its nature, purpose and methods, while in these opening years of the twentieth century what is called—euphemistically perhaps—the literature of education has become so voluminous that no thoughtful man would venture to read a tithe of it. And apparently the subject is not exhausted. Year by year books on education are issuing from the press in geometrical progression. Journals and magazines devoted exclusively to the discussion of educational topics are published quarterly, monthly, fortnightly—and some of them hebdomadally—to the number of about one hundred in this country alone. Our National Bureau of Education, created by an act of Congress in the year 1867 to collect statistics regarding the condition and progress of education in the United States, and to diffuse information respecting the management of schools and methods of teaching, has in pursuance of the end of its creation added since 1868 many bulky volumes and numerous circulars of information to our engorgement of pedagogical erudi-

Entered accordinging to Act of Congress, in the year 1905, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

tion. Nor is this all. Teachers meet annually for the purpose of exchanging ideas on matters connected with their profession, or of listening to the wisdom of those who have attained eminence in seats of learning; and thereafter the printed report of what was said, and done, and resolved demands a resting place on our library shelves. Assuredly for the last century or so multitudinous streams from many sources, and of various characters have been disemboguing into the ocean of educational literature. But in our own days education is being industriously and multifariously discussed and defined, subjected to experiment, discussed again, and redefined as never before. The science of pedagogy now counts its votaries by the thousands. And the smiling schoolboy, whom Plato in his old age declared with a torrent of Greek superlatives to be the most insidious, sharp-witted, insubordinate and unmanageable of all animals, has become a problem as entrancing and suggestive as the trusts and their parents, the protective tariff and the railroad rebate.

The question naturally arises: What has been the outcome of all this intellectual activity? Have our school systems from year to year by their uniform growth in practical efficiency, in certainty and uncapricious constancy of disciplines, and in fulness and wisdom of scope exhibited the sagacity and rational worth of the voluminous literature published in recent years "to promote the cause of education throughout the country?" Has the idea underlying the word, "education," been more precisely defined, and the purpose of the processes indicated by the word been more accurately fixed? Are the fruits of education in our country to-day any evidence of the value of the thought that has been expended on it?

I.

To give an answer that cannot be reasonably controverted to this question, we ought to determine what education is, and what effects it should aim at producing in those that are subjected to its influences. The word itself is freely used, being one of the shibboleths of the age, and like many words of the kind it fluctuates in meaning. Education has, as I have just said, been defined in many ways by recent pedagogical writers. Some of these definitions are colored by the writer's philosophic or sociological views, and consequently manifest his predilections, and implicitly convey his bias. As a rule in seeking his definition he has been wanting in purity of intention. He has obviously, perhaps unwittingly, framed it with an eye to the conclusions he wished to inculcate, or the practical changes he desired to effect. Consequently he often excludes from the concept of education much that the word historically implies,

and includes, unduly emphasizes or exaggerates much that is peculiar to his personal beliefs regarding man's destiny, his purpose in life and the nature of his social and civic relations. Assuming that education is a generic term, comprehending various kinds and not a word signifying a number of disparate and unrelated processes, I doubt if any definition can be proposed less unwarranted and more neutral than the traditional one, which simply asserts that education is the unfolding and development of man's faculties, the educing from the potentiality of the individual—to use the phraseology of the schools—of that physical, intellectual and moral maturity and perfection in act of which the individual is capable. Every disciplinary process, therefore, by which this maturity and perfection are in any degree attained is in the widest sense of the term educational. This definition preëmpts no theoretical position, and begs no vexed question.

In a stricter sense education may, without prejudice to any theory, be defined to be a full and harmonious development of those faculties that are distinctive of man, namely, of his intellectual and moral faculties. The primary purpose of all education, properly so called, is to develop and train mental powers and to form and to fix character. To develop intellectual ability without a homologous development of character is to create social Frankensteins; and to form character while neglecting the faculties of the mind is to deprive of tools one best fitted for using them well. Mental powers and moral character are both undoubtedly needed in order that man may fully and harmoniously realize self; but undoubtedly also the most important for personal well-being and for the stability of society are the moral powers. The capacity to use intellectual gifts most effectively without an inward sense of moral responsibility to control and direct their use makes man like some great ocean ship possessing powerful propellers, but wanting a sane pilot. On the other hand, the disposition ingrained by training to guide conduct by moral ideas, even when unaccompanied by wide knowledge and ripened intellectual efficiency, is a source of individual strength and of social value. So long as man is by nature destined for life in the society of his fellow-men, a faculty capable of perceiving clearly and fully the essential relations between himself and other men, and a will trained to adjust habitually his conduct to his perceptions is of the highest necessity for his own safety and happiness, and for the social order of the community in which he lives. This will be evident if we recall briefly the aim of civil society.

In every well ordered civil community there is a tendency making for progress and a tendency making for civilization. Progress is an external and instrumental element in the well-being of a civil

community; civilization is its intrinsic complement, the goal of its perfection. Progress comprises wealth, the agencies that most effectually produce wealth, what wealth can procure, material comfort, the conveniences of life and the material aids to refinement. Civilization denotes intellectual and moral qualities that make community of life agreeable, salutary, finished and ennobling. Progress calls for the exercise of the commercial and industrial virtues; civilization demands something more. The *respublica* or common weal is not limited to the Midas-like faculty of turning everything into gold. There are some things that cannot be turned into gold, and some things that gold cannot produce, without which, nevertheless, life in the society of our fellow-men would, in accord with evolutionary standards, become a mere struggle for existence in which the physically strongest, the shrewdest and the most unprincipled would survive. Civilization imports first in the individual man that he is a *civis* not only of this or that nation, but also of the ideal commonwealth, called humanity, and that he acquire the virtues that make him *civilis*, and secondly in the organized political body a consciousness of common interests and purposes, of solidarity and of a humanizing destiny. A people may for a time be progressive in a high degree, and may possess a spurious refinement, deceptive by its appearance, without being highly civilized; and a people may be advanced in civilization, though lacking in progress. The measure of a people's civilization is their practice—not merely their profession—of the virtues which liberalize ideals and conduct; the measure of their progress is the skill and industry with which they use their intellectual powers to control and adapt to human needs the forces of nature. Progress of an advanced kind may be conditioned by the possession of coal and iron, or other material bounties of nature; civilization will depend proximately on the reign of justice and ultimately on mutual benevolence and an unselfish sense of solidarity.

Justice and benevolence may be counterfeited by umbral substitutes. Justice may be a legal right written in the fundamental law of the people, and every one may by law be entitled to exact it—if he can; or it may so inform their life, so fashion their modes of thought, so mould their habits of action that it will be mutually and spontaneously granted. Justice is not legality. Legality measures the extent of a citizen's obligations by the enactments of legislatures or the decisions of courts, and upbraids him only when and because by his deeds he has risked the possibility of incurring legal retribution. Justice is ampler than the law of the land; it reaches the inner recesses of thought as well as the outward action of which the law takes cognizance, together with many others that evade the

meshes of the law. It is, moreover, motived by a principle that is universal in its application, and independently of penalties is sacrosanct in its decrees. It is only when personal traits of a superior kind, wisdom and charity, breadth of view and sympathy, self-respect and reverence for the manhood of others prevail that this virtue becomes—what legislation can never make it—the vital custom, the instinctive habit and the daily manners of a people, and that civilization assumes a character of maturity.

Again, mutual benevolence and the sense of human fellowship may be supplanted by philanthropy, which sinks all personal sympathy and the warmth of neighborly love in devotion to a cold, abstract and scientific virtue which we have recently called altruism. Altruism and charity are as opposed in principle as are the nadir and zenith, although the manifestation of one bears a resemblance to that of the other. One is the transfigured selfishness of utilitarianism, the other is the joyous forgetfulness of self in the love of another. That they differ, St. Paul intimates in his first epistle to the Corinthians. "If I should distribute all my goods to the poor," he says, "and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." One may, therefore, in St. Paul's judgment, bestow one's fortune on others and be ready to sacrifice life itself for them, and yet not have the virtue of charity. Charity implies more than the conferring of alms on others. Its specific character and distinction are not determined by the exterior act, but by the interior motive of acting and the inward attitude of mind and heart towards the person who is its object. The altruist out of some partial principles creates an idol, "a cold spectral monster" Hawthorne calls it, which is only a reflection of himself, "projected upon the surrounding darkness." Out of regard for this idol he distributes his donations, unstirred by any emotion towards the recipient. The man who has charity forgets self and is motived only by a feeling of personal love for a fellow-being. Altruism, therefore, is seated in the head, charity in the heart. The difference between altruism and benevolence may be illustrated by the contrast between the repentance of Judas and St. Peter. Both had committed the crime of treachery to their Master, and both repented. But the repentance of one sprung from grief at his self-degradation, which made him shame-faced and horror-stricken in his own presence, and being centred in self could not reawaken the loyalty of friendship. The repentance of the other was inspired by unselfish love of his Master; his sorrow transcended self; he grieved rather for the injustice done to and the pain inflicted on a friend than for the baseness of character which his crime had laid bare. The ever-abiding consciousness of his own baseness he would gladly have

borne, might he thereby undo his disloyalty. Judas, had he lived and acquired wealth and the contentment that his nature would have found in wealth, might have been capable of altruism; Peter alone of the two was capable of a personal love for his fellow-man. Hawthorne in his Blithedale Romance delineates with the touches of a master's pencil the soul, the workings and the fruits of altruism and charity. In the characters of Hollingsworth and Priscilla are respectively depicted the all-devouring egotism of the philanthropist with his heartless devotion to the amelioration of humanity and the strength of human tenderness and love on which Hollingsworth leaned when his altruism had wrought evil for himself and ruin for Zenobia. Hollingsworth's sense of duty was sterile because it was impersonal, and inhuman because it was without heart.

> Himself unto himself he sold;
> Upon himself himself did feed,
> Quiet, dispassionate and cold.

Altruism is the virtue of the narrow aristocrat of whatever species, who aloft in his superior sphere drops the crumbs of his superfluity to the needy of a lower plane, and never casts his bread upon the water that he does not expect it to come back to him in the comfortable glow of proud beneficence, in increased popularity, or in security for vested interests which the less fortunate might disturb, if they did not sometimes receive a dole of loaves and fishes. Charity is the virtue of democracy, when the spirit of democracy is animated not by the cant of political theorists, but by living belief in the brotherhood of man. When men's minds are profoundly convinced and their hearts feel that other men have the same nature as their own, however obscured by the artificial and conventional distinctions of class or the accidental differences of race, are created for the same ultimate purpose and communion in the same destiny, and have as a consequence the same essential rights and the same dignity of personality, the lawyer's question, "Who is my neighbor?" is answered. When, furthermore, they have brought home to themselves the truth that men, being made coheirs with Christ, have become adopted sons of God, the brotherhood of man will cease to be an emotional metaphor.

Civilization, therefore, will grow or decay in proportion as justice and mutual benevolence or legality and altruism are the virtues that characterize the individuals that constitute it.

II.

The adequate purpose of education, so far as it regards the present life, is to form citizens, that is to say, men and women

capable of promoting progress and enriching civilization. If that be not the purpose of it, it is hard to see why the State should attach so much importance to it. It should aim, therefore, at procuring the development of powers and the formation of habits that secure and enlarge prosperity, and at evolving the faculties and virtues that humanize feeling, widen outlooks and elevate ideals. But undoubtedly its paramount aim should be to fit youth for civilization, that is to say, for life in a civil community. However adapted a young man may have become as the result of education to increase wealth, if he be unsuited to live in the fellowship of justice and benevolence with other men, his education is worse than a failure; it is likely to be a disaster to himself and a menace to society. If the scope of education is narrowed to the production of a highly efficient dollar-hunting animal, or if this be the predominant scope, the material well-being of the community is provided for at the sacrifice of its social well-being. A man so trained may observe the law of the land without being a *civis*. He may be legally a citizen with the right to vote and to be voted for; but he is not necessarily a citizen in the ethical sense. Men may be induced to observe the law from one of three motives: self-interest, fear of superior physical force, or love of righteousness. And unless observance of law springs from this last as the dominant motive, we may have "honored and respected citizens" who are clear-sighted enough to see that their business enterprises are more secure under the reign of law, and that it is on the whole to their advantage to avoid incurring the risk of legal penalties; but not men possessing the moral attributes of citizenship. Such men may be law-abiding in appearance and to the outward eye of the State. If circumstances arise, however, in which they may with impunity violate the law, and appropriate to themselves some of the fat of the land, there are in their code of ethics no principles prohibiting action. Take away the love of righteousness as a motive of conduct and a civil community becomes a pestilential congregation of freebooters, who have adopted some "laws of the game," keep up some appearances of well-behaved propriety, and publicly profess theoretic adherence to some principles of right. Now righteousness is a moral quality. An education, therefore, which does not primarily aim at the development of the child's moral nature and which does not ultimately effect this development, whatever other merits it may have, has this drawback, that it tends to produce a type of character against whom society must be constantly on its guard, and to whom the laws of God and man are tolerable only in so far as they subserve his personal interests, and failing in this are to be observed only when he cannot, through mental adroitness acquired from

education, devise subterfuges and deceits to avoid their sanctions. Can this be the end to be attained through education?

A man whose moral nature has been undeveloped, or by defective educational processes impaired, is a social nonconformist whose unfitness for civil life, and therefore for civilization, increases in proportion as his intellectual powers are enlarged. A political controversy which has recently engaged the attention of the country will illustrate the principle which I have just enunciated. On the concrete merits of that controversy I have, of course, nothing to say. Under that aspect it has no bearing on my subject, belongs, moreover, to the domain of practical politics, and there it may remain so far as I am concerned. I am only using as an illustration the principles that underlie the controversy and which are assented to by both political parties. Whatever the political allegiance of an American citizen, he admits as a fundamental and essential characteristic of our Government the distribution of supreme political power in three different departments, and accepts as final the advice of Washington, who warns us in his farewell address to see to it that those entrusted with the legislative, judicial, and executive powers confine themselves to their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the power of one department encroachment upon that of another. When the legislature is wise and prudent, the judiciary just and fearless, the executive strong and temperate we have good government. But if any of these supreme powers loses its proper virtue, or permits the usurpation of its functions by another, then the organic unity of the State is deranged, and a first step has been taken, the logical issue of which is either anarchy or despotism.

Now the human soul is a republic whose legislative power is intellect, whose judicial power is conscience, and whose executive power is the will. Each of these powers in the soul of a child demands a training in keeping with its own nature and its relation to the other powers. The enfeebling, defective unfolding or stunting of any of them will result as disastrously for the individual as the weakening of the analogous civil powers will for the State. If the result of education is to leave the republic of the soul with a conscience that is undeveloped or corrupted, or a will that is egotistic, arbitrary and overpowering, or an intellect that has become subservient to the lawless movements of the will, an individual has been produced who is unfit for citizenship in a civilized community and is suited only for anarchy or despotism. And if millions of such citizens are annually produced in a nation, it requires no vision of a seer to foresee the outcome. History tells us of no greater scourges of humanity, of no men less fit for social and civic life

than those men who use their powers of intellect to contrive means of carrying into execution the mandates of a will uncontrolled by conscience. And experience teaches us that the social evils that threaten the peace and security of a people are rooted ultimately in the fact that the due balance between the powers of conscience, will, and intellect have been disturbed; that conscience has been corrupted or malformed, and intellect made the slave of lawless will. Any system of education, therefore, which does not aim at such a correlated development of the child's will, conscience and intellect as shall habituate it to confine these powers within "their respective constitutional spheres" is an education which has excluded the ideals of civilization from the scope of its attainment. We may train the intellect to cleverness, ingenuity and subtlety; we may inspire the will with an eager desire to compass material well-being, honor, seats in high places; but if we exclude from our school the systematic and rational training of conscience, no plethora of books or horde of pedagogical writers can obscure the fact that we do not know what education is. Unless, therefore, the child has been taught to regulate its desires and the movements of its will by the dictates of right reason and the judgments of a sound conscience, the man will subordinate righteousness to the prosecution of his personal purposes. He may as a result of education have acquired the sagacity that unerringly apprehends a remote and materially valuable end, skill in adapting means to its attainment, and energy and despatch in their use—and these qualities are undoubtedly worth acquiring; but without an inward sense of probity to rule and control his conduct in the employment of the natural and human agencies which he manipulates, they become the forces through which all that is finest within him grows coarse. He may attain a commanding position in commercial, financial, administrative or political arenas, but his very success creates for the community a civic ideal that is false and harmful.

III.

I said that the child should be taught to govern itself by the dictates of right reason and the judgments of a sound conscience. The reason is not difficult to find. For the moral conduct of life we require: first, general principles of right and wrong, which the intellect recognizes as expressions of a supreme law to which unconditional obedience is due, and secondly, rectitude of mind in applying these precepts of morality to the individual and concrete circumstances of life. There are as a consequence in the education of a child two elements—the inculcation of right principles of conduct

and of solid grounds for the obligation of conforming daily actions to principles; and the formation of an intellectual habit whereby one so reverences moral laws as to make application of them unerringly, and on motives that are superior to though not necessarily independent of personal considerations. Therefore, knowledge not only of what is right and what is wrong, but also of the ultimate reasons why one ought to do the right and avoid the wrong; and reverence, or a sense of awe in the presence of moral obligation, are the essential elements in the education of a rational being and in the formation of a citizen in a civilized state. These two, knowledge and reverence, have been recognized by every clear thinker since the days of Plato as the cardinal forces of education. The need of reverence in education, its complementary character in relation to knowledge, its necessity for civic life, is an oft-repeated theme, especially of his dialogues on the Republic and on Laws. Tennyson utters the aim and the aspiration of every true teacher in the familiar verses:

> Let knowledge grow from more to more,
> But more of reverence in us dwell;
> That mind and soul, according well,
> May make one music as before,
> But vaster.

With regard to the first element there is little difficulty so far as the content of morality is concerned. It is only when there is question of its form, of determining the why and wherefore of its obligatory character that confusion, vacillation and incertitude arise. The spirit of Christianity has so pervaded our moral atmosphere that the *zeitgeist*, though it distorts and rejects its doctrinal teachings, cannot cast off the moral precepts of which those teachings are the basis. The canons of right and wrong which Christianity has fixed have in the main become the principles of our civilization, and are accepted theoretically at least even by those to whom the dogmas of Christianity are foolishness and a stumbling block. Even systems of morality which are thoroughly anti-Christian in substance and bent endeavor to adjust themselves to the common moral sentiment of the age. The very fact that they make the attempt at sacrifices of logical consistency, and of what they would call scientific precision proves that the spirit of Christianity has yet a hold on the soul, although in many quarters it has lost its influence over the reason. As a rule the ideals of righteousness which the religion of Christ presented to a world that unaided reason had betrayed into moral and religious degradation, are by subtle and informal inferences known and intellectually felt to be the substructure and support of our civilization. These ideals in their higher shape are not, it is true, received except as beautiful forms of religious poetry,

counsels of perfection, which we contemplate with devout emotion, or with which we embellish our pulpit oratory; but which in stern practice that neoteric deity called the Spirit of the Age, with its triune feature of profit, honor, pleasure, declares offensive to modern ears. And it must furthermore be confessed that even the imperatives of that ideal are sometimes and with regard to some lines of conduct stammeringly and hesitatingly spoken by the exponents and advocates of the age's morality. The fervent discourse of many a preacher and the eloquent page of many a moralist, when looked at closely, will be found to resolve itself into the confession of Jeremiah, before the Lord put forth His hand and touched his mouth: "Ah, ah, ah, Lord God; behold I cannot speak, for I am a child." Nevertheless, making these concessions, it must be admitted that the impress of Christianity is on our moral standards in so far as they exhibit precepts of conduct.

But when it comes to determining the ultimate and cogent reason of obedience to those precepts the failure of modern ethics is impressive, and would be appalling, if the law that is written in the heart of man could be wholly obliterated, and the "light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world" could be extinguished. The word "ought" has been either wholly or nearly emptied of significance by the ethical writers who represent this age. At best the reason advanced for declaring a given action or course of conduct good or just, and its omission bad or unjust, may be such as to compel assent of the intellect; but they cannot exact the unconditional obedience of the will. The necessity they produce is logical, not moral. If we demand why we ought to do what is just, humane, or virtuous, and why we ought not to do what is unjust, inhumane or vicious, we are given answers which show that either the nature of the question is not apprehended, or that the word "ought" has lost its distinctive meaning. Why ought I do what I know to be right? Why may I not, if I find it agreeable, profitable, and sometimes even respectable, indulge in wrong conduct, provided I am well-bred, prudent and temperate? Why must I, even when it is disagreeable or entails danger and sacrifice, walk in the narrow path of rectitude? No system of Eudaimonism gives an answer. He who tells me that right conduct is obligatory because it promotes happiness, is ennobling, advances the interests of humanity or is required for the welfare of the State has simply failed to apprehend the initial problem of Ethics; he has not even assigned a universal and objective norm of right and wrong, let alone an ultimate ground of obligation. Nor does any system of rational Deontologism give an answer, though this may be said to the credit of such systems, they do not debase or nullify absolutely the concept

of moral law. All of them, however, from Kant with his autonomous reason, which is endowed with the power of furnishing categorical imperatives when occasion demands, to Hegel, with his statolatry and pantheistic reconstruction of Hobbes' "great Leviathan," leave the superstructure of morality hanging like the Hindoo turtle in mid-air. They either invest man himself through some faculty with authority to command himself, or they create out of abstractions a figmen which they christen Humanity, or the State, and whose mandates they ask us, after making an act of faith in its existence and sanctity, to accept as obligatory.

Now it is a fact, I think, which conversation and observation will confirm, that most men outside of those whose inner life is governed by Christianity, are to-day utilitarians in their personal practice of morality, some of them actually Benthamites,* and Kantians or Hegelians in the principles they profess when on parade, and in the standards they set up for others. Many of them may never have read a page of Bentham, or Mill, or Kant, or Hegel; but they have imbibed the views and principles of those writers from newspapers, novels, and magazines and in the intercourse and competitions of business and social life. Yet, unless the precepts of morality impose an unconditional obligation on the will, and unless the source of that obligation is a being, real and actually existing who is superior to man individually and collectively and on whom man is absolutely dependent, it is impossible to think of morality as anything else than a precarious scheme of behavior, somewhat more universal in its reach than the conventions of good society. It does not, of course, fall within the scope of this paper to discuss the value of modern systems of Ethics. Nor is such discussion really needed. The complete breakdown of these systems is known to every one whose duty it is to become acquainted with them and is now nearly universally admitted by ethical scholars. They have multiplied books and like the friends of Job they "have wrapped up sentences in unskilful words" with the sole intention of establishing moral obligation without admitting the existence of *One* who alone can bind in conscience a human will, and the only success they have

* Bentham in a posthumous work, curiously entitled Deontology, declares: "It is, in fact, idle to talk about *duties;* the word itself has in it something disagreeable and repulsive; and talk about it as we may, the word (*sic*) will not become a rule of conduct. . . . Every man is thinking about *interests.* It is a part of his very nature to think about interests. . . . To interest duty must and will be made subservient." And again: "The talisman of arrogancy, indolence and ignorance is to be found in a single word, an authoritative impostor, which in these papers it will be frequently necessary to unveil. It is the word, 'ought'—'ought' or 'ought not,' as circumstances may be. . . . If the use of the word be admissible at all, it *ought* to be banished from the vocabulary of morals."

attained consists in confusing men's thoughts, and in preparing the way for moral skepticism, and in imposing intolerable burdens on those whose profession obliges them to keep acquainted with their adversaries' briefs. The modern spirit is like the children of some millionaire fathers who enjoy superbly the fruits of the wealth they did not produce, and would like to thrust the creator of it as far as possible into the social background. It is rather an ignoble spirit, immeasurably so when the object of its aversion is the infinite and ineffable reality from whose all-bountiful goodness spring being and the dowries thereof. Being ignoble it cannot elaborate a morality that will appeal to the deep inherent instincts of the soul, or satisfy those primal cravings of it for holiness and righteousness that proclaim its kinship with the Deity.

It may be galling to the devotees of the modern spirit to base their morality on God and religion. But until they do so it shall possess neither stability nor fruition. Until two fundamental positions are admitted there is no possibility of teaching morality effectively. These are: first, certain modes of conduct are the expressions of an absolute exemplar of conduct, the impress of which is found in our rational natures; and, secondly, the Being of whom our nature is an image, and on whom it depends primarily for its origin, and ultimately for its final perfection, necessarily wills and ordains that only actions fully in accord with the exigencies of our nature are lawful, or, what is the same thing, that conduct *ought* to be in conformity with the absolute exemplar. This concept of morality entails the admission of a supreme legislator, to whom we owe absolute obedience, and involves Ethics with religion. It is therefore distasteful to the modern spirit which desires to construct a system of morality independent of God, and to inculcate duty without obtruding the disagreeable idea of obligation. But if there is any necessity of teaching morality to secure the true happiness of the individual, the safety of the State, and the well-being of the race, there is the same necessity of teaching religion, the existence, namely, of a Supreme Being, who manifests to us through our higher faculties the decrees of His eternal law.

Nor is it enough to know what is right or wrong, and why we ought to do the right and avoid the wrong, in order to render morality effective and enduring. Reverence must increase and consummate knowledge. Knowledge as such appeals only to the intellect; unless invested with something that touches the heart it has no motive power over the will. Bare truth of itself is incapable of arousing an emotion, of inspiring a purpose, or of impelling to action. Of whatever kind it may be it does not differ in its influence on the conative faculty from a perfectly demon-

strated proposition of geometry. Man is more than a reasoner; he is a doer, and as such an emotional being. Unless a known truth therefore is clothed with a quality that approves it to the will, it cannot become a motive of action.

Now reverence is an intellectual emotion, complementing the knowledge of divine law and impelling to its observance. On its intellectual side it arises from a *quasi* intuitive apprehension of the excellence of another, when the elements of that excellence are superior power and worth. Power without worth we may fear, and worth without power we may respect and honor; but neither of them singly do we reverence. It is only when the two excellences are simultaneously perceived to be the conjoined attributes of another, that the rational ground of the emotion called reverence is present. Evidently, therefore, reverence primarily and directly regards a person, appreciation of whom does not spring from, but transcends the formal processes of deductive or inductive reasoning, although in balanced and receptive intellects it will often accompany the conclusions of such reasoning when concerned with the nature or character of a person. We do not feel reverence towards an abstraction nor toward a work of nature or art, however beautiful, imposing, or sublime they may be, except in so far as contemplation of them excites to reverence for him whom they represent, or whose supremacy and excellence they attest. On its emotional side reverence is a mingled feeling, responding to the two personal attributes by which it is awakened. To reverence is to hold in awe because of superior power and in highest honor because of superior worthiness. The awe of reverence is not fear, since it arises from no threat or anticipation of impending evil, and is compatible with the highest degree of love. St. Paul tells us that Christ, as man, offered prayer and supplication to His Heavenly Father and "was heard for His reverence;" in Him, however, there could have been no fear of God. It may coexist with hope realized and a sense of spiritual elevation, as in the blessed who enjoy the beatific vision of God and adore Him in reverence. In fact, reverence necessarily includes some measure of love for the person reverenced, and some degree of spiritual elevation in the person reverencing. Yet a feeling akin to fear undoubtedly forms an element of this emotion. The very word by which it is denominated is borrowed from the Latin term which etymologically connotes fear. It is not, however, the fear of dread or terror, but the fear of humility and modesty, the rational self-abasement arising from conscious inferiority to another, mingled with care and prudent apprehension regarding the outcome of any act or course of conduct of which the person reverenced may become cognizant. Hence the word used by St.

Paul in the original text of his Epistle to the Hebrews to designate the reverence of Christ for His Heavenly Father signifies cautious and scrupulous regard in conduct for the will of another.

IV.

In the human conscience reverence attains its holiest and most sacred expression. Through conscience man knows himself to be in presence of a Being of surpassing power and incomparable worthiness, of whom he stands in awe and for whom he feels the highest form of respect; knows, furthermore, that its dictates and injunctions are the authoritative voice of that Being. Conscience, therefore, does not simply apply the precepts of morality to individual cases, in much the same way, for instance, as reason might apply the general principles of a mechanical science to the solution of a particular problem of construction or engineering. It does this and more. It reveals the fact that these precepts are the ordinances of a supreme personal legislator to whom unconditional obedience is due, not because of the sanctions decreed for observing or transgressing His commands, but because of His sovereign right to reverence. The need, therefore, of inculcating reverence for the formation of character is as evident as the necessity of training conscience for the same purpose. There are some who, without due analysis of their own thought, I think, and full realization of the consequences of their own theories, have denied this, in maintaining that the principle of authority should be excluded from the class room. Yet no one acquainted with the psychology of the human soul can seriously contend that mere knowledge or intellectual development is of itself sufficient for the right formation of character. Such a thesis is, moreover, constantly disproved by the records of our criminal courts, and the efforts of our legislators to devise laws which will effectively restrain intelligent and expert lawlessness. Unless reverence be the result of education—reverence for God and the truths and commands and ways of God; reverence for all forms of authority, parental, civil and ecclesiastical; reverence for the family, the hallowed associations of home, the sanctity of the marriage bond and its sacred obligations; reverence for the neighbor, the dignity of his personality and the inviolability of his rights; reverence for ourselves, for our bodies that are the tabernacles of our souls, and for our souls that are made to the image and likeness of God—unless, I say, reverence for all things worthy of reverence be so inculcated in childhood and youth as to become a habit of manhood, education is worse than a failure; it is an unparalleled misfortune. It has left the republic of the soul without

a tribunal of right and wrong and without a judicial power to enjoin and compel execution. It has made wisdom, which is knowledge acquired under the elevating and vitalizing influence of reverence, an alien to science, and the higher ranges of truth an unknown or barren region.

But to fashion the minds of the young to habits of reverence conscience must be educated, since the reverence of conscience is the norm and exemplar of all reverence. Conscience cannot be educated without teaching morality. Morality cannot be taught unless religion is part of the curriculum of the school. There is no more possibility of teaching moral obligation without teaching the existence of a supreme legislator than there is of teaching the duty of filial love without admitting the fact of a father. There may be men, who from motives of worldly prudence or from temperament conform their lives in the main to those dictates of morality which regard their relations to other men, at least in so far as their lives are open to the inspection of the public. But men normally observe the whole law of morality only from motives of religion, and oftentimes in spite of temperament and the suggestions of worldly prudence. Unquestionably it is an historical fact that the morality of a people degenerates into some form of hedonism, utilitarianism or stoicism when not based on religion. It is equally certain that if religion is not taught in childhood and youth, its influence over conduct in later life will be problematic. Unless, therefore, religion supplies a fundamental law or constitution under which the republic of the soul lives, the intellect may know and proclaim, haltingly it is true and with some errors, the law of right and wrong which is inscribed in the heart, but there is no judicatory of conscience to keep the executive power of will from going outside its "constitutional sphere."

Briefly, if the paramount aim of education, so far as the State is concerned, is to fit the growing generation for future citizenship in a civilized community, the question proposed at the beginning of this paper reduces itself to this: What evidence is there in the disciplines and instructions of our schools and in the type of character which they develop that our voluminous educational literature has contributed to the ideals of civilization? If true citizens cannot be formed without inculcating morality, what indications are there that our copious pedagogical writers have aided in the formation of upright and conscientious citizens? If integrity of character and unselfish devotion to social responsibilities and civil duties are not normally found apart from religious convictions, what proofs are there that our schools through the persuasive wisdom of modern educators have furthered our religious life as a people? These are

definite questions. It may be denied that it is the purpose of our schools to form citizens in the adequate sense of that term. It may be contended that the training of conscience is not an element in the education of a citizen. It may be maintained that conscience can be trained without moulding the soul of a child or youth to habits of reverence. And one or other of these positions is in fact concealed in the public proclamations of many who have discussed this question of education. But if none of them can be held, the question which I propose can be answered categorically by ingenuously looking at facts. I shall attempt an answer to it in the next issue of this magazine.

TIMOTHY BROSNAHAN, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

CATHOLICITY AND SOCIALISM.

IT IS difficult to estimate accurately any complex system of thought or of policy. It is doubly difficult to compare and then judge two complex systems of thought and policy. There is danger of mistaking accidental for essential, relative for absolute; of seeing what one looks for instead of what is to be found; of unfairly comparing best in one with worst in the other, where the systems are antagonistic, and of failing to see the actual difficulties inherent in a position which one holds. It is difficult, therefore, to compare Catholicity and Socialism. Yet it is necessary. The two systems of thought and policy are disposing forces for a contest, already well under way, and the world is not large enough for the supremacy of both as they now stand.

The question of method in the study of the two is important. Brownson, in writing of Liberalism and Socialism in 1855, said: "To rightly comprehend a system is not simply to detect its errors. We understand not even an erroneous system till we understand its truth; and its real refutation lies not so much in detecting and exposing its fallacies as in detecting, distinguishing and accepting the truth which it misapprehends, misinterprets or misapplies. Socialism commends itself to the intellect of its adherents only in the respect that it is true, and to their hearts only in the respect that it is good. . . . If we wish to produce a favorable effect on them and to refute their system for their sake, we must begin, not by denouncing their error, but by showing them that we recognize and accept their truth." Later in the same essay he says:

"But when erroneous systems are in arms or arming themselves against society, we do not think it the proper time to draw attention to their side of truth and goodness, for it is then a more urgent duty to defeat them and save society from the ruin they threaten than it is to labor to convert their adherents from their errors."[1]

While the type of Socialism that Brownson saw was quite unlike the types that we now meet, his words contain suggestions which have value for us to-day. We must be active against organized Socialism, but the activity should not be allied with unfairness, ridicule or disregard of our own difficulties.

The situation of the Church is interesting. She opposes vigorously organized Socialism and defends the present social order. And yet there is very much in the facts, tendencies and principles of to-day which she must repudiate and even condemn. The Church is not a welcome companion in the company of the nations. England shows a record of scorn, oppression and fury against her, and middle-aged men remember the awful hate awakened when the hierarchy was restored. France despoils, persecutes, banishes, suppresses institutions through which the Church acts. Germany has not yet lived down the memory of the Kulturkampf. Italy, Switzerland, Russia show little friendliness for her, and while in this country our institutions aim to be fair, we may not ignore the actual spirit of opposition to the Church manifested in many ways. In a word, the administration of modern governments show relatively little regard for the Church as a power in the social order. Secondly, the Church sees in our modern institutions and liberties a number of principles which she would not and could not teach as they are now accepted. Modern science is frankly against the main philosophy of life on which the Church rests. Our educational system violates her fundamental view of what education means. The modern State has encroached on the jurisdiction claimed by the Church. The main tendencies of society are worldly and perilous to her. And yet, in spite of all in modern life that is against her, in spite of governments and principles and tendencies, the Church appears as the defender of this social order, stands against Socialism, the enemy of this order, and demands sanction for law, respect for authority and protection for institutions, without thought of resentment or motive of gain, without commission from those she would save or reward from those she would serve. Uninfluenced by what is undeniably attractive in Socialism and undeterred by what is unmistakably against her in the present order, she is animated by a conviction that transcends both and looks to the ethical and spiritual beyond. It is worth while to attempt

[1] Works, Vol. X.

a study of the relations of Catholicity and Socialism with a view to understand their relations.

TWO PHILOSOPHIES OF LIFE.

Ordinarily we understand best those things which we can translate into the terms of our own experience. As in logic, so in life, we proceed to the unknown from the known. When we are conscious of our experiences, when we correlate and interpret the facts of every day life, the things we feel, the things we do, and those we suffer, resist or surrender to, we grow in insight, judgment and power. The laboring man who understands the facts in his own life, who measures the forces which affect his wages, his home, his work; who observes, compares, judges what his employers and his fellow-workers say and think and do, is a thinker, and he has a philosophy. Through the understanding of his own experience he is able to understand those about him. Interchange of views, similarity of experience, of circumstances, of culture, build up a class view, with estimates of social forces and laws.

Few men understand thoroughly their own lives. Many live and work and die who never interpret, never compare, never rise above the dull monotony of physical existence. Some men are awake and thoughtful, but as successful as they care to be. Others, discontented, eager, become conscious of themselves and of the facts in life. They study, interpret, think. The fact that two men are hod-carriers and work side by side does not make them mutually companions, while the hod-carrier and the bank cashier who feel alike and think alike will show the frankest mutual sympathy and delight in exchange of views.

A very large number of men are now thinking, interpreting the everyday facts of life, recognizing forces at work and reading contrasts which these forces create. An active propaganda has created abundant literature, and zealous teachers work constantly. The life of the individual is the text-book, and the facts in his life furnish question, illustration and answer. Universal education, the habit of general reading with some leisure for it, the press, the habit of expressing thought, a bold, fearless spirit of criticism and advocacy are circumstances which add meaning to the movement. The spirit of this tendency has brought personal experience prominently forward as the criterion of life; and individual men and women are induced, taught, encouraged to judge government, religion, institutions by and through their own personal experience of them rather than by a large impersonal social standard. The most marked products of this process are trades unions and Socialism.

Socialism is a philosophy of life based on life. It is an interpretation and coördination of the facts in the individual laborer's life. And since the industrial process, machinery and business have made the main facts in most laborers' lives identical, these understand one another readily. Socialism explains to the laborer his wages, his home circumstances, his struggles, his aspirations, his compulsory self-denial; it explains the character and actions of his employers, the luxury, the extravagance of the rich, the corruption of politics. The things which the laborer sees most clearly and can best understand are thus coördinated to construct a view of life. Socialism uses the laborer's vocabulary; it tells him things felt but not expressed; it speaks in ways that he understands, and hence becomes in this day of agitation, aspiration, discontent and awakened intelligence a philosophy of life based on life experience; an explanation to the laboring man of his personal life history, and an appeal to him to realize his happiness through its direction.

There is another philosophy of life and society which we learn not from life, but from books, teachers, history. Religion, government, school, social authorities generally teach us a systematic philosophy which disciplines and directs life. We have now not philosophy drawn from life, as with Socialism, but life subjected to a philosophy. The great principles of this philosophy are drawn from history, from estimates of the courses of nations and peoples, and, in the case of Christianity, from divine revelation; more true and safe because thus derived. But these social and religious principles, derived as they are from race experience (or in the case of religion, directed to race needs), are not based on the current experience of individuals. We who learn this philosophy acquire it by study, not through life and living, and many are content to learn it in a purely formal way. We may give our assent without testing, may argue without doubting, prove without convincing and expound without adjusting to changed conditions. Schools are not life, they are inventions, hence the philosophy of life taught in them does not always become as real as one might wish, nor does it always enlist sympathy as one might expect.

It is wonderful to see how men do accept and hold political, social and religious principles and do submit to the personal discipline entailed; how they have curbed emotions, corrected ambitions, sustained distress and practiced patience in obedience to a philosophy so difficult to understand and so severe to follow. But, on the other hand, it gives cause for concern to see the extent to which men are withdrawing from the spirit and from the letter of that law and gradually drifting into the other. Complex processes are everywhere casting doubt into minds big enough to receive it, but

not strong enough to overcome it; minds active enough to understand their worth, but too small to see their limitations; broad enough to see one class and its interests, but not deep enough to see all classes and all interests.

For present purposes we may call Socialism the summa of one philosophy and Catholicity the summa of the other.

All forms of social discontent are sympathetic with one another. It is not surprising to find moral discontent allied with intellectual, or industrial, associated wth political. One is interested when one finds spelling reform in an anarchist sheet, and cooking reform and dress reform in a socialist colony. The vocabulary, temper, methods, experience of most kinds of reform are identical, as in all cases there is revolt against an established order.

Complex as Socialism is, there is in it little that is distinctive or distinctively new. It is a new coördination of many old things, or of things which are not essential to it. The atheism of many Socialists other than those who adhere to Marx and his philosophy is but a fraction of the atheism of modern society, found high and low, among learned and ignorant. And this atheism is generated by forces distinct from Socialism, but acting possibly parallel to it. The free love nonsense affected by many Socialists is only a fraction of the free love practice and quiet belief of large numbers who are encouraged by the diminishing respect for the family and its defense. The home succeeded by flat and boarding house, work of mothers and children, loss of family traditions, divorce, weakening of the family tie brought on by constantly moving from place to place; the school assuming functions which the parent gladly surrenders, falling marriage and birth rate—all these things weaken the family and lead to the loose sentiment so widely expressed. Hence forces distinct from Socialism are attacking marriage and the home. Socialism acquires honestly its impulse to revolution, since revolution had its share in giving the world some of the modern constitutions and modern liberties.

Socialism's economic theory was learned from the most orthodox masters. Its notion of equality and fraternity was learned from the social order that it threatens; its philosophy of history is from Hegel. Its collectivism is distinctive, the proposal to socialize capital being its essential tenet. Not Socialism, but the age, favors atheism, loosens the bonds of the family, challenges authority and taught false economics. Socialism has united, systematized fragments of discontent into a coherent philosophy, and this philosophy is so close to the facts of life,so satisfying to one who looks at present merely and not at past or future, at individual or class, and not at race; it is so soothing in the freedom from self-

discipline which it promises that it is a real vital power to its believers.

A recent writer has said: "Among the Stoics every man was a Stoic. But among the Christians, where are the Christians?" The Socialist is always a Socialist. Is the Christian always a Christian? The former understands his lessons well, can argue vigorously, is eloquent, certain, aggressive, dogmatic, since his emotions, feelings and sympathy are all engaged. The Christian laborer is not so well equipped in his philosophy, since its principles and its methods are difficult. In a way, he is led to resist the advance of Socialism on account of his personal attachment to the Church. He may be temperamentally opposed to Socialism, as millions are, but the strength of the Catholic system against it will depend on the perception of the Church's definite attitude toward it. We are called upon, therefore, to develop a Catholic attitude, a Catholic literature, a Catholic judgment of the issue. The situation to-day is in some respects similar to that referred to by Newman when speaking, in 1840, of Methodism while still an Anglican:

"Had it been met with a definite theology, with an analysis of its errors and a precise discrimination of what was true in it from what was false, its supporters would have felt that the Church had a meaning in its words, and they would have been necessarily thrown on the defensive; but the vague, unsystematic mode in which they were encountered did but create in their minds an impression of their own superiority; as if their own view must necessarily be taken by all who would be religious, for none other could be found."[2]

SOCIAL ORDERS.

A social order is a definite arrangement of men in society according to rights, duties and relations, all of which rest on a fundamental conception of man. Institutions, states, religions, laws, social conventions return in final analysis to an estimate of man. Changes in this estimate bring progress or retrogression, clashes between different estimates bring revolutions. One conception of man gives us absolute monarchy, another gives us democracy. We see now in the bitter struggle in Russia the efforts of a new estimate to establish itself and to change institutions.

There is a religious estimate of man derived from the teachings of Christ. According to it man is spiritual, destined for future life. Men are children of the Father in heaven, brothers in Jesus Christ. All rights, relations, duties flow from this estimate, as do all proportions among values in life. The fundamental social law of

[2] Essays, Critical and Historical, I., p. 412.

Christ is that strength shall serve weakness. Dependence and independence appear providentially, and God's law is, to sanctify the latter through its service of the former. Riches serve poverty, learning serves ignorance, health serves disease, the high serve the lowly, the free serve the enslaved, the virtuous serve the sinning. Christ Himself, the source of knowledge, power, grace, liberty, served man, who was poor, defiled, degraded, ignorant and enslaved. He, the mighty one, placed the weak and tender child as model, as ideal for the strong who would seek His kingdom. On this law of God the social order should rest. The virtues are the laws of that kingdom, grace is power, sin is evil. Mercy, kindness, truth, together with faith, charity, justice and self-denial, should govern life, and that government should express the will of God. And all life should express that law—civil, social, industrial, intellectual institutions should safeguard and develop it, because all life is referred to it and all institutions are destined to protect it.

There is a political order, expressing another estimate of man. It is incomplete and mainly negative, as a rule favoring the greatest degree of personal liberty as shown in the modern State. Men are called free and equal, and the State should leave them so by equally protecting all who have equal rights. Classes are formed by nature, by voluntary agreement or by law; the State looks upon the individual as sharing the status of his class and fixes his legal rights and duties accordingly. But in the main he is left to himself and encouraged to self-reliance and personal endeavor. This political conception falls far short of the spiritual view and fails to enact it.

Beyond the two orders mentioned we have the industrial order, which has assumed such commanding importance in our day. Man is wealth-producing, wealth-possessing. Institutions exist largely to sanction rights and duties springing from property relations. The removal of restraint, due to the negative attitude of the State toward religion and industry left man to the play of industrial forces. Development has been such that the selfish motive is dominant to-day and the law of the industrial world is that weakness shall serve strength. The strong have become powerful, and strength has returned to its pagan habit of self-seeking; the weak have been weakened, and weakness renders compulsory service to strength.

These three conceptions of man coexist to-day. The Christian law that strength shall serve weakness is maintained by Christian churches, but without legal sanction, support or social promulgation. The political principle that men who are equal are equal before the law and are regarded neither as strong nor as weak, is

adhered to as faithfully as can be by the State. But in fact the industrial order is dominant, and its law that weakness shall serve strength is to an extent supreme. Representatives of religion teach and appeal and organize to conquer the situation, with but partial success; States, as far as their traditions permit, enact laws to protect the weak, to curb the strong, but disappointing patchwork results. We see few traces of the Christian principle in the business or industrial order; little mercy, kindness, service, brotherly love; little serving of weakness by strength. Representatives of the industrial order are powerful in legislation and in government, shaping laws, hindering restrictions and securing advantages. State and Church are fighting against that supremacy, and every variety of reform now seen in society is merely an aspect of the struggle.

Out of the turmoil and conflict a fourth conception of man is arising, and it makes a powerful appeal. It is voiced by Socialism, offering a definite conception of man, his right and duties and proposing a definite social order to realize it. Allowing for variations honestly admitted by Socialists, we may say that they aim at an approach to equality among men. The strong should be disciplined and the weak strengthened, with a view to make men equal. This equality should have its basis in the material order. All institutions, industry, law should aim to approach and preserve equality and independence. Society would own all capital, conduct all industry, exact labor from all and return to each the maximum of what he produced. This revenue, based on personal labor, supplemented by the care of authority for general features of life, would insure comfort, independence, culture to all. Socialism assumes that present institutions are bankrupt; that the industrial order is absolutely supreme; that Church and State are enslaved to capital and interested in perpetuating its domination. The new social order proposed by Socialism rests on a new conception of man, his rights and duties, and aims to overthrow the order now established. Built up from the aspirations, life experience and feelings of those to whom the present order has brought least, the philosophy of life which Socialism teaches appeals strongly to great numbers and challenges with greatest assurance the truth, the mercy, the power of the philosophy which Church and State represent.

GENERAL SPIRITUAL TENDENCIES.

It was stated above that the industrial order is too powerful in society; that it has to a great extent overcome the Christian and the political principles which Church and State try to maintain. If we appeal to our own personal experience, each to his own daily

life, we discover readily sufficient illustration. The lack of loyalty, honor, honesty in business, in our daily buying and selling; the heartlessness of adulteration of food and medicines; frank refusal to respect humanity if profits are reduced or business threatened are so well known that we are scarcely conscious of them. Men are compelled to be selfish; the appalling prominence of the money motive in life and the physical need of possessing and accumulating it so modify motives, sympathies and pursuits that the Christian conception of life is seriously affected in nearly every aspect. Our interests, our rivalries, our plans chill the Christian feeling into torpor and leave us commercial, but not Christian. The strong and the weak are separated in sympathy, in interest, distant from one another in their places of dwelling, and both unsanctified because of that. While men as individuals may remain more or less Christian, the process of personal sanctification is endangered. The social supremacy of the material or economic principle and motive is pitted against the individual supremacy of the Christian principle and motive, with the result that the former triumphs only too often.

The Church's message is primarily to the soul. If she have aught to do with Socialism it must be because of peril to the spiritual interests of society. Does the essential notion of Socialism, namely, collective ownership of capital, contain anything, theoretically, with which Catholicity need find fault as a menace to the soul? If Catholicity antagonizes it, the reason is to be sought in its relation to faith and morals. It is well, therefore, to make a its external relation to the soul. It is well, therefore, to make a review of the spiritual situation with a view to find the tendencies of the present and the relation of Socialism to them.

1. The spiritual sense is becoming dull. The soul is not of commanding importance in modern society. Probably this complaint is always to the point, but it is surely justified now. Mind is recognized everywhere, but soul is neglected. Neither scholarship nor statesmanship nor politics nor industry nor culture is much concerned with the interests of the soul, if we except the scholarship of religion. Good morals are a social necessity, philanthropy is honorable and social service is popular, but we miss the soul from among the factors that count to-day. However the individual may believe, however earnestly he loves the spiritual and recognizes in the soul the image of God and the pledge of his dignity as man and Christian, he lives in a social order and social atmosphere where he finds it difficult to sustain his spiritual sense. The worldliness of the world, its power of attraction so multiplied by progress, the concentration, absorption and fascination of business and the need of working diligently to accumulate, to save, to provide, have

all given prominence to other features of life, to the detriment of the soul; hence the dulling of spiritual perception, the habit of directing life and shaping judgment as though there were no soul.

2. The sense of sin is becoming dull. The presence of God in the social world, the imperative supremacy of His law, the sanction of His will for individual human dignity, individual rights and obligations are not perceived with sympathy or accepted with love. Conscience remains after a fashion, but by the time that divine laws intended to guide it have penetrated the social atmosphere and reached the individual's mind they are so changed as to have lost much of their force. National conscience, political conscience, business conscience, social conscience are formed in some way that misses the presence of God and the recognition and integrity of His law. This dulling of the sense of sin may be seen in many ways. Men revise and shorten the catalogue of sins, new social processes and practices which are real sins are not so recognized, the thought that social duty has a divine sanction is neglected, the thought of God loses its social force. Sin seems not to consist in omission at all, but only in commission, and the sins of commission are fewer. Even where the law of God is known, the presence of custom, ambition, difficulties of income and strain of want, habits of self-indulgence lead to habitual violation and then to self-exculpation.

3. We find in society increasing disregard for self-discipline, self-denial, penance. In fact, it is quite unusual to mention such things in a social study. Yet the Christian cannot deny that they are prominent in the mind of Christ, central in His teaching and essential in the sanctification which He awaits in us. Not as an end, but as a means, they are part of the process by which we reproduce the spirit of Christ in us. They are necessary to us when they are needed to keep our emotions pure, our impulses unselfish, our interests loyal to God's and our love of our fellow-men active and true. When life is lived without the spirit of self-denial, penance and discipline a wrong sense of proportions establishes itself. These practices are sentinels to guard the mercy, purity, unselfishness, loyalty that Christ demands and the Christian social order presupposes. We look to our institutions, to our environment, to current philosophy for support, sympathy or sanction of these vital Christian practices, but we find indifference and neglect. Even in Christian circles, and among good Christians, the function and power of self-penance, self-denial, self-discipline are misunderstood and underrated.

4. Coördinately we discover in the spirit of the time a diminish-

ing sense of personal responsibility. Our individualism has developed wonderfully strong men, but conditions have produced many weak men. The currents of life are so strong and relations so complex that men tend to abandon themselves to the current. The strong surrender to their strength and the weak surrender to their weakness.

Hence the great cry now is environment. The weak are taught that they have no responsibility—circumstances shape them. Men, always glad to escape responsibility, too readily believe, and abandon themselves to environment. It explains sin, success, power, weakness, all things. Learned men teach this as determinism, but when it reaches the classes it is a pleasant form of escaping the sense of guilt. One finds on all sides proof of this tendency to underrate, if not ignore the sense of moral responsibility.

5. Finally we find, too, a dulling of the sense of duty as such. Everywhere we insist on getting our rights. One social class believes in its own rights and in the duties of the other classes. These believe in their rights and miss the sense of obligation. Neither rights nor duties are looked upon as spiritual things so much as social conveniences. The far-reaching social effects of this tendency may be seen in the constitution of reform movements and in the personal history of individuals.

Newman in his sermon on "The Religion of the Pharisee the Religion of Mankind" summarizes the situation in this striking manner:

"I know men profess a great deal and boast that they are Christians and speak of Christianity as being a religion of the heart; but when we put aside words and professions and try to discover what their religion is, we shall find, I fear, that the great mass of men in fact get rid of all religion that is inward; that they lay no stress on acts of faith, hope and charity, on simplicity of intention, purity of motive or mortification of the thoughts; that they confine themselves to two or three virtues, superficially practised; that they know not the words contrition, penance and pardon, and they think and argue that, after all, if a man does his duty in the world according to his vocation he cannot fail to go to heaven, however little he may do besides, nay, however much in other matters he may do that is undeniably unlawful. Thus a soldier's duty is loyalty, obedience and valor, and he may let other matters take their chance; a trader's duty is honesty; an artisan's duty is industry and contentment; of a gentleman are required veracity, courteousness and self-respect; of a public man, high-principled ambition; of a woman, the domestic virtues; of a minister of religion, decorum, benevolence and some activity. Now, all these are instances of mere Pharisaical

excellence, because there is no apprehension of Almighty God, no insight into His claims on us, no sense of the creature's shortcomings, no self-condemnation, confession and deprecation, nothing of those deep and sacred feelings which ever characterize the religion of the Christian, and more and more, not less and less, as he mounts up from mere ordinary obedience to the perfection of a saint."

These five spiritual senses, if one may so term them, are closely allied in their functions and are, in fact, variations of the simple realization of the soul's existence. The sense of the soul, of sin, of self-discipline, penance and self-denial, of personal responsibility, of duty may be considered as interdependent. If we look for evidence of the presence of these senses in our politics, our business and in our everyday dealings with others we quickly discover the tendency referred to and see to what an extent they have been dulled into the inaction that causes such concern to-day.

This condition shows us that the material order and industrial forces are predominant, and that the Christian order and Christian forces are greatly weakened. Now, spirituality of life depends on these spiritual senses. The Church expresses primarily a revealed conception of man, of God, of Christ, of men's rights, duties and relations. She has elaborated her doctrine into a system, she has evolved a ritual, a form of worship and has cultivated a system of religious emotions. The Church exists because there is a soul, because sin exists, because the Incarnation and Redemption were for sinners; because the mission of Christ is perpetual to souls. The sense of sin, the reality of the soul, the sense of penance and discipline, of responsibility, of duty are central, vital, as the duty of sanctification is supreme in life. The Church must look for the soul everywhere, judge institutions finally by their relation to it; she must foster penance, build up the spirit of Christ and aim always to win from any and all legitimate social orders sympathy and support. It is, of course, true that we may err in emphasis. When we see the soul too vividly we may neglect the body, as St. Francis did; in teaching individual responsibility we may underrate social environment; in teaching penance we may have forgotten that comfort, too, and relaxation have their place; in teaching duty we may have said too little about rights. We may err in emphasis, but we dare not for a moment surrender the main doctrine or yield to any tendency which robs society of the very essentials of spiritual life, these spiritual senses. The Church watches, legislates, preaches, teaches to foster and save them, and she must judge civilization and institutions by effect on them.

From this standpoint the Church must, in a way, condemn the present condition of things as deeply to be regretted. And she

does. From her pulpits, her press, her scholars, her leaders, her hierarchy, her chief ruler condemnations go out daily, startling in volume and in significance. And in all proposals for reform, in every remedy suggested we find central the reawakening of the spiritual senses, duty, discipline, self-restraint, kindly service, humane love of fellow-man. The reëstablishment of the soul's supremacy in life would shatter the tyranny of the material, the reawakening of brotherly love would do more than laws and States. But conditions prevent the Church's word from a fair hearing. Her constant complaint about the danger to the spiritual senses in society, her constant prayer for the restoration of the soul to its authorized primacy in life are unheeded or unheard.

The tendencies antagonistic to the spiritual senses are recognized as dangers; they are regretted, and every effort at reform, every attempt to reassert the political and humane and Christian principles against the supremacy of the selfish and material makes for the saving of those senses. There is reasonable hope that we may succeed to a fair degree. Here Catholicity enters judgment of Socialism. Whatever error in doctrine, ignorance of fact, fault in method, distortion of emphasis, malice in propaganda we may charge against Socialism, undeniably it is in the main a protest against the supremacy of the industrial order in life and an effort to equalize conditions of life for all men. Its essential tenet is collective ownership of capital—a certain, unfailing means, it is claimed, of social salvation. We may take the most extreme and hopeful form of the proposition, such, for instance, as the words of Edward Everett Hale at the world's Parliament of Religions in Chicago:[3] "The twentieth century will give to every man according to his necessities. It will receive from every man according to his opportunity," or accept the most generally adopted term—socialization of capital—and still, as it stands historically, attractive as it is in many ways, Catholicity mistrusts it deeply, and I think must do so.

Catholicity represents a spiritual philosophy which is to discipline and shape life. Socialism in its least offensive form is a philosophy based on life; and the two philosophies are, here and now, to a great extent, exclusive. Socialism's philosophy certainly tends to eliminate the spiritual senses by diminishing emphasis if not always by exclusion. What Catholicity regrets and condemns as an accident and an abuse in the present order is found in Socialism enthroned as a principle and sanctioned as a law. Socialism comes with no sense of the soul's reality, no sense of sin, of discipline and penance, of individual responsibility. Its analysis of social wrongs omits sin as

[3] Report, Vol. I., p. 524.

a factor, its constructive reform contemplates no spiritual power, no reassertion of the supremacy of God and the sanctity of His law. Naturally the type of Socialism known as Christian is not included in this statement. It would require special treatment from a scriptural point of view.

Differences of emphasis easily merge into differences of doctrine. It seems fair to say against Socialism that its exaggerated emphasis of body over soul, of comfort over grace, of environment over personal responsibility, of institution over sin; its professed attempt to make life self-sufficient and to arrange its values without reference to a hereafter, equal in fact difference of doctrine between it and Catholicity. We may hear many Socialists who are spiritually minded protest that this statement is unfair. One would welcome a fairer statement if one found it. The first difference, then, that we note is one of emphasis; Catholicity emphasizing future life, soul, sin, self-discipline, individual responsibility, duty; Socialism emphasizing present life, body, comfort, environment, rights, material enjoyment. The most conservative Socialist takes issue with Catholicity there. Gradually we get a less conservative class of Socialists who push the emphasis to the extreme, and the difference is increased. Socialism now may ignore God, soul, sin, responsibility, self-discipline and speak only of its own philosophy as adequate. A step farther we reach direct negation of God, soul, free will, religion, the supernatural. Then Socialism is in a frame of mind for everything. When that moral and spiritual vacuum has been made, atheism, free love, revolution, confusion of standards rush in and all fuse into a total hideous repulsive mass of hate, irreverence, limitless aspiration and discontent.

Possibly Catholics in opposing Socialism pay too much attention to its features which are identified with atheism and free love, and thus miss the deeper spiritual danger contained historically in its simplest form. Brownson, in writing of Socialism as he found it in 1849, said:

"The essence of Socialism is in this very assumption that our good lies in the natural order, and is unattainable by individual effort. Socialism bids us follow nature instead of saying with the Gospel, resist nature. Placing our good in the natural order, it necessarily restricts it to temporal goods, the only good the order of nature can give. For it, then, evil is not remediable, or good attainable, by individual effort. We depend on nature, which may resist us, and on the conduct of others which escapes our control. Hence the necessity of social organization, in order to harmonize the interests of all with the interests of each, and to enable each by the union of all to compel nature to yield him up the good she has in

store for him. But all men are equal before God, and since He is just, He is equal in regard to all. Then all have equal rights—an equal right to exemption from evil and an equal right to the possession of good. Hence the social organization must be such as to avert equal evil from all and to secure to each an equal share of temporal goods. Here is Socialism in a nutshell."[4]

A recent expression from a Socialist representing himself as a Catholic is to the point as indicating accurately the difference between Catholicity and Socialism. He wrote in the *Appeal to Reason*, December 19, 1903, replying to Bishop Matz, who had preached a series of sermons against Socialism: "All men are more the creatures than they are the creators of their circumstances, and therefore the gulf that separates the saint from the sinner, the hero from the common mortal is not so much of individual merit or goodness as it is of circumstances. The evils from which we suffer are due more to the social conditions surrounding the individual than to any inherent wickedness in the individual himself. Individual responsibility there is, to be sure, but it is infinitesimal compared with social responsibility. Any government which vests the people with plenary power, which recognizes the right of self-government, necessarily repudiates the idea that man is born with wicked tendencies. . . . All democratic forms of government, therefore, recognize the inherent power of man to grow, develop and rise in the social scale by a natural process." Really the economic or political theory of Socialism is not its inspiration. To the soldier the flag is not cloth, it is a symbol. So phrases are symbols, not thoughts, to the Socialist. Catholicity has no great concern with Socialism's pure economics, but it has much concern with any attempt to explain life and reconstruct it by excluding the spiritual forces on which its guidance depends.

Catholicity believes that man's heart is chiefly to blame for social wrongs, Socialism blames our institutions, our environment. Catholicity looks on the social question as mainly one of sin, Socialism sees no sin, sees only social questions. The Socialist takes advantage of class hate and appeals to it, Catholicity would extinguish it by the charity of God. Thus Socialism presents an analysis of social questions which includes no element of sin; it proposes a plan of reform which makes no note of grace. Catholicity sees sin omnipresent, and the redeeming power of Christ intended to conquer it. She looks to conscience in her final hope—conscience whose torch is lighted by the hand of God, but in Socialism she hears only of institutions to replace it, and these built on an unspiritualized humanity. Catholicity looks for repentance in the heart,

[4] Works, Vol. X., p. 95.

contrition on the lips and love in the eyes of all reform, but she finds in Socialism the heart unmoved to feel its guilt, lips speaking only words of spiritual forgetfulness and eyes brilliant only with the hope of present conquest.

Catholicity has seen the ages. The Church has seen sin undermine institutions where repentance alone could have saved them. She has seen sin in the strong and sin in the weak, in the high and in the low. This universal and appalling fact is the key to her philosophy of history, of government, of property, of law, of society. She sees sin deeper than States, domestic with every people, at home in every clime. Her theologians ascribe the origin of property to sin and they would be the first to advocate its abolition did it promise relief. No less a reformer than St. Francis of Assisi said that "from possession arise difficulties and disputes which put obstacles of all kinds to the love of God and neighbor." The Church has seen civilizations decay because of sin and institutions fail because of it and noble purposes die shamefully from its deadly touch. She has seen the paralysis of it creep in among her children, into highest and holiest places, disturbing her noblest work, and carrying ruin and humiliation where the peace and purity of God had dwelt. This great race fact of sin called down Christ in redeeming love and created the need out of which the Church herself arises. It is not strange that the sense of sin and of God's presence and redemption are found everywhere in the Church. And to-day, in a world that is losing the sense of sin and forgetting its prayer for grace and knowledge from above, the Church's penances, fasts and abstinence, her devotions, her prayers, ritual, benedictions, her traditions, discipline, institutions stand with impressive stability, proof of her unvarying realization of the reality of sin and the need of grace in human life. Truly she is the prophet of God in a forgetful age.

The Church does believe, and profoundly believe, in human and divine brotherhood, in charity, in justice and peace, but she looks for them at the end of the process of sanctification, and not at the beginning. She looks for reform after repentance, peace after penance, joy after faith and progress through grace. There is a quaint simplicity but deep penetration in the words which Newman quotes from an old Bishop who said of the hermits: "By their merit the anger of the Supreme Judge is abated, a healthier atmosphere is granted, corn springs up more abundantly, famine and pestilence withdraw, the State is better governed, prisons are opened, the fetters unbound, the shipwrecked relieved."[5] Then Church would expect material and social progress after spiritual regeneration,

[5] Historical Sketches, II., 411.

while Socialism expects it independently of the soul. The Church understands social life from the standpoint of sin and grace; she believes in the spiritual senses and trusts no reform, accepts no promise and shares no hope for better days unless purified hearts be laid as foundations for our institutions and divinely guided conscience control their functions.

Fr. Cuthbert in his volume on "Catholic Ideals in Social Life" (p. 78) says with much justice:

"The Socialists, in insisting upon the solidarity of society, have become to an increasing number of men the exponents of a deep moral truth. It is a truth which Catholicism has borne evidence throughout the long ages of its history; but the Socialists, by preaching this doctrine with a loud voice and perpetual insistence, have made themselves in popular estimation its proper exponents. In opposing the Socialist propaganda Catholics have perhaps failed to recognize sufficiently this Catholic truth behind the vagaries and errors of Socialist teaching, and thereby seemed to the populace to ignore it. Where the Socialist goes astray in the application of this truth is that he seeks to realize it in practices by legal coercion to the exclusion of the claims of individual conscience; he inordinately deprives the individual of a share in the moral government of his own life, and makes him a mere creature of the State or community. Catholicism, on the other hand, seeks to realize the moral solidarity of the race by making the individual the custodian of the common good, and making him primarily answerable to God, and only in a secondary degree to the State. Thus the Church preserves inviolate the proper liberty of human life. The Socialist would force a man to labor by legal penalties; Catholicism makes his own responsibility depend rather upon his own innate sense of social justice. Not that the Church would altogether disapprove of legal pressure being brought to bear upon the idle to force them to work, only that normally her aim is as far as possible to make a man's conscience, rather than legal coercien, the guide and informant of his moral life; whereas the tendency of Socialism is to supplant conscience by external law."

It is no wonder then that Catholicity shrinks back from Socialism, even in its mildest form because it misunderstands totally her philosophy. In reducing social evils, even social sins and injustice to private ownership of capital, Socialism presents a scene of confusion, error and positive danger that she fears. When she is told by a Catholic Socialist that "the private ownership of the means of production and distribution is the cause of all poverty and the suffering resulting from it, all dishonesty in dealing and all crimes committed for the gain of money or property," she recognizes a confu-

sion which she dreads.[6] When she is told that socialization of capital will bring back the redeption sought, she cannot believe. However noble the purpose that prompts this remedy and loyal the service that its adherents would render, Catholicity cannot accept it. When she hears that human nature is better than we think, pure and noble always in proper environment, she cannot escape her own conviction that personal moral responsibility has an important rôle, and that only by strong belief in it will it be secured.

The spirit of Catholicity and the spirit of Socialism are antagonistic as both stand historically. Socialism is a philosophy constructed from life experience alone, intended to bring comfort, present peace and entire justice to all men; it is unrelated, generally, to the future, to the soul, to sin. It accounts for social evils and sin by social institutions, and promises remedy through institutions. Catholicity is a philosophy of authority intended to shape, direct, discipline life. It seeks first the Kingdom of God, and the spiritual is its absolute criterion. Soul, sin, self-discipline, personal responsibility, duty are its fundamental thoughts. It looks for social reform through individual moral reform. Socialism looks for individual reform through social reform. Catholicity looks to conscience mainly for its hope of the social order, and Socialism looks to a social order for conscience. Both use some terms in common—justice, fraternity, equality, peace—and hence many are led to believe the two to be identical. They are alike in the sense that a cone is like to its own image reflected, in inverted perspective. Hence proportions are different. The generous impulse of Socialism, its justifiable criticism of conditions which shame us and sadly tell of the failure of religion to conquer the situation, may not be denied. It does appeal to noble men as well as to ignoble, and does contain, as Brownson said, many elements of noble truth.

Limits of space hinder for the present the development of this view of the problem to a point of satisfactory completeness. Suggestion rather than decision was kept in mind throughout. Many secondary questions have been raised, the thorough discussion of which would be necessary in order to reach a final view. Thus, for instance, the actual relation of social institutions to sin, the power of environment over development, the degree to which Socialism's criticism may be true and strong, the elements of truth in its teaching and of justice in its contentions, the degree to which in our own position we may err in emphasis are all pertinent, and a fair attitude to Socialism can scarcely be taken unless we work out these problems thoroughly. Again there is the whole question of the positive policy of the organized Church toward organized Socialism, and

[6] Open letter from a Catholic to Pope Leo; Brown.

vice versa. When Socialism formally attacks the Church she is certainly justified in self-protection, justified in going beyond the purely spiritual in her defense.

Taking a large view of the situation, it seems that we need a spiritual judgment of Socialism in its mildest, least objectionable form. A line on which such judgment might be based is suggested here. We might then construct the whole line of defense and meet Socialism always with the discrimination that justice demands and the fairness that truth imposes.

Finally, one should not lose from sight the wider application of this principle of spiritual judgment which leads the Church to condemn much in the present social order whose stability she defends against Socialism.

William J. Kerby.

Washington, D. C.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE ORIGINAL APOSTLES TO THE FACT OF THE RESURRECTION.

FOR the disciples of our blessed Lord His bodily resurrection was an event of supreme importance and significance. It was the transcendant miracle to which they could triumphantly point to prove to their contemporaries that He was truly the Messiah, the Son of God. Their own faith in the Messianic claims of Jesus had been rudely shaken by His ignominious death on the cross. They had shared the view prevalent in their time that the Messiah would not die, but would live on forever in company with His elect. Jesus had proclaimed Himself the author and giver of life. His unlooked for death seemed to give the lie to these claims. In those first hours of separation from their beloved Master the disciples were overwhelmed with grief and dismay. Their hopes would have been buried with Him in the tomb had they not been reassured by personal contact and communication with the risen Lord. It was the resurrection of Jesus and His reappearance in His glorified state that revived their faith and gave them an adequate conception of the kingdom and of the Messiah. Thus it had a dogmatic as well as an apologetic significance. They were brought to recognize that the kingdom, while begun on earth, would be found in its perfection only in the life to come; that it was through the resurrection that Jesus had entered into His true Messianic glory. His risen life became the pledge and pattern of what their life would be who believed in Him and lived for Him.

Thus the resurrection, while not the sole ground of faith, was for the disciples an all-important one. Without it their faith in the Messianic calling of Jesus would have come to naught. Through it their conception of the Messiah was perfected. To it they could appeal in their preaching as the convincing sign of Jesus' divine mission. Hence the faith they preached was faith in the risen Jesus, reigning gloriously at God's right hand. Devotion to the risen Lord was the great impelling motive of their heroic labors.

Had no explicit record of the empty tomb and of the appearances of the risen Lord to His disciples come down to us, there would still be sufficient historical ground for believing that He truly rose from the dead. We should still have as evidence the firm conviction of the apostles that He was risen; for it cannot be denied that from the very outset they preached Christ not only crucified, but risen from the dead, and proclaimed themselves witnesses of the resurrection. This conviction was the unfailing source of that wonderful zeal and courage that carried them on, in the teeth of bitter persecution, to the glorious accomplishment of their great mission. It was on this faith in the risen Christ that the primitive church was built.

The truth of this important assertion does not rest wholly on the first few chapters of Acts. Many radical critics discredit these opening chapters as largely made up of early mythical lore. But the same aspersion cannot be cast on the epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, Romans and Galatians. Even the radical critics are constrained to acknowledge them as genuine. Now these epistles offer unquestionable evidence that the bodily resurrection of Christ was an all-important element in the earliest preaching both of St. Paul and of the twelve; that in the minds of all without exception faith in the risen Lord was indispensable.

It was from profound conviction that the apostles thus preached the resurrection of the Lord from the dead. The charge of deliberate fraud on the part of Jesus' disciples has long been abandoned and reprobated by all self-respecting scholars. It is repugnant to the sense of decency to question the sincerity of those souls of fire, exemplifying in their daily conduct their lofty moral teaching, sealing their testimony with the pain of many hardships and persecutions, and in not a few instances with the blood of martyrdom. Now the only satisfactory and adequate explanation of this conviction is that Jesus actually rose from the dead and made Himself known in His glorified state to His disciples.

This conclusion would be warranted even if the apostles had left no circumstantial evidence in support of it. But they have done more than to declare themselves in a general way to be witnesses of the resurrection. They have left on record evidence so varied

and so strong as to leave no reasonable doubt that Christ truly rose from the dead.

We shall not consider in the present article the interesting testimony which St. Paul gives of his personal experience of the risen Lord, but shall confine our attention to that of the original disciples of Jesus. This testimony is found in the four Gospels, in the first chapter of Acts and in I. Corinthians xv., 3-8. For the sake of clearness we shall arrange it under four heads: first, the testimony to the death of Jesus; secondly, to His burial; thirdly, to the empty tomb on the third day; lastly, to the objective appearances of the risen Lord.

I. THE DEATH OF JESUS.

The testimony given by the four evangelists to the death of Christ on the cross is unquestionable. They all tell how He was condemned to death by Pontius Pilate, forced to carry His instrument of torture to the place of execution without the walls, and was there crucified between two thieves. If the stern sense of obedience in the Roman soldiers detailed to carry out the execution could not be relied upon to make sure the death of Jesus, the bitter enmity of the Jewish authorities was a sufficient guarantee. It were idle to question the statement of the four evangelists that He died on the cross. (Mat. xxvii., 50, Mark xv., 37, Luke xxiii., 46, John xix., 30.) The fourth Gospel offers corroborative evidence in a statement which few critics would refuse to accept as genuine Johannine tradition, even those who do not take the Gospel to be the direct work of John. The disciple whom Jesus loved, who was an eye-witness of the crucifiixion, solemnly declares that when the soldiers came to break the legs of the crucified so as to hasten their death, they broke the legs of the thieves, but after they were come to Jesus, when they saw that He was already dead, they did not break His legs, but one of the soldiers with a spear opened His side, and immediately there came out blood and water." (John xix., 32-34.) No further proof could be desired that Jesus was really dead.

II. THE BURIAL IN THE TOMB.

All four evangelists relate that Joseph of Arimathaea, a wealthy disciple of Jesus, obtained of Pilate permission to take down the lifeless body of Jesus, and that he laid it nearby in a new tomb, hewn out of the rock. (Mat. xxvii., 57-61, Mark xv., 42-47, Luke xxiii., 50-56, John xix., 38-42.) They also tell of the stone rolled up against the entrance to close it. Matthew and Mark record that this stone was of great size (Mat. xxvii., 60, Mark xvi., 4.)

This substantial agreement of the four evangelists is not shaken by a curious discrepancy between the Synoptics and the Fourth Gospel on an incidental detail. According to John xix., 39-40, before the body of Jesus was laid in the tomb it was embalmed according to Jewish custom, being wrapped up in a linen winding sheet with a hundred pounds of myrrh and aloes brought by Nicodemus. The Synoptics seem to know nothing of this. They content themselves with the statement that the body was wrapped in a linen cloth, while Mark and Luke plainly imply that the embalming had not taken place, for they tell how on the morning of the resurrection the women came with spices to the tomb for the purpose of embalming Jesus. (Mark xvi., 1, Luke xxiv., 1, cf. xxiii., 56.) Similar divergencies of detail are to be found scattered through the Gospels. Far from weakening the main testimony, they do but confirm it by showing the absence of anything like collusion on the part of the evangelists. Paley's aphorism applies here: "The usual character of human testimony is substantial truth under circumstantial variety."

Matthew adds to the general evidence an important and interesting detail. After the body of Jesus had been laid in the tomb, the Jewish authorities came to Pilate, "Saying: Sir, we have remembered that that seducer said, while He was yet alive: After three days I will rise again. Command therefore the sepulchre to be guarded until the third day: lest perhaps His disciples come and steal Him away and say to the people, He is risen from the dead: and the last error shall be worse than the first. Pilate said to them: Ye have a guard: go, guard it as you know. And they departing, made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone and setting guards." (Mat. xxviii., 63-66.)

III. THE EMPTY TOMB ON THE THIRD DAY.

The four evangelists likewise agree in asserting that Jesus died the day before the Sabbath, that is, on a Friday, and that His tomb was found empty the morning of the first day of the week, that is, Sunday. In this four-fold story of the empty tomb there is again considerable variety of detail and some divergence that makes it impossible to combine all into one absolutely consistent account. But the main purport of the story, the discovery of the empty tomb by the women and its verification by one or two of the apostles cannot reasonably be discredited.

According to John, it was Mary Magdalen who first came to the tomb, alone. She found the stone rolled away and the tomb empty. Not knowing what it meant, she ran to Peter and John and told

them in tears that the body of Jesus had been taken away, she knew not where. (John xx., 1-2.)

According to the Synoptics, the tomb was discovered empty, not by Mary Magdalen alone, but by several women together, she being in the number. Mark and Luke say they came with spices to embalm the body, a thing which precludes the notion that Mary was already aware of what had happened at the tomb. To their great surprise, they found the stone rolled back and the tomb empty. While they stood there bewildered, they were informed by an angel (two according to Luke) that Jesus was alive, having risen from the dead. (Mat. xxviii., 1-10, Mark xvi., 1-11, Luke xxiv., 1-12.)

The last two Gospels supplement the testimony of the women with that of St. Peter and St. John. According to Luke, the women were not believed when they told the Apostles what they had seen; but Peter ran to the tomb, and looking in, saw it was empty, only the linen cloths remaining. He went away wondering at that which was come to pass. (Luke xxiv., 10-12.) According to John, when Mary Magdalene came and told Peter and John that the body of Jesus had been taken away, both ran to the tomb and entering found it empty, as Mary had said. They saw the grave cloths lying to one side and apart by itself, the face cloth rolled up. (John xx., 9.)[1]

In the testimony thus far reviewed it is important to note that the discovery of the empty tomb was a thing for which none of Jesus' disciples were prepared. It is true their divine Master had told them more than once of His approaching death and resurrection on the third day. But the current idea of the Messiah was that He should not die. This idea the Apostles shared as well, and so Christ's repeated prediction of His death and resurrection was so foreign to their expectations that they did not heed it. In the words of Luke xviii., 34, "They understood none of these things, and this word was hid from them, and they understood not the things that were said." It was only after the event that the meaning of these prophetic utterances dawned upon them. "For as yet

[1] Matthew's statement that the Jewish authorities asked of Pilate a guard for the tomb because of Jesus' prediction that he should rise from the dead on the third day, is not out of harmony with what the evangelists say of the failure of the apostles to keep this prediction in mind. Neither the Jewish authorities nor the apostles expected that the true Messiah would die. Hence, for the very reason that they believed in the Messianic office of Christ, his disciples did not heed his prediction of his death and resurrection. On the other hand, the hostile, unbelieving Jews were eager to catch and retain every saying of Jesus that had, in their judgment, the character of an unwarranted pretention.

they knew not the scripture that He must rise again from the dead." (John xx., 9.)*

As the thought of the resurrection was absent from the minds of the disciples, so, too, they had not the slightest expectation of finding the tomb empty on the third day. This is plainly implied in every one of the Gospel accounts. Had the Apostles looked for such an event, it would have been the one absorbing topic of their conversation. The devout women would have rehearsed it with the disciples. Not one but would have awaited the third day with feverish impatience when they would have hastened to the tomb to see the glorious fulfilment of their expectation. But how differently runs the story! On the resurrection morn the Apostles are absent from the scene, with no thought of the tomb. It is the women, coming with spices to embalm the body who discover to their amazement that the tomb is empty. Even when they announce to the Apostles what they have seen their report is received with incredulity.

It is not the disciples alone who give testimony that on the third day the tomb no longer contained the body of their crucified Master. Among the witnesses to the fact must be included the very enemies of Jesus. Unwelcome as the news was to them, they showed by their conduct that they were forced to recognize its truth. It was a fact they could not deny, though it was to their interest to gainsay it, if denial were possible. Their witness to the empty tomb is thus particularly impressive.

That they recognized the tomb to be empty is shown by their collusion with the guards, recorded by Matthew xxviii., 11-15. These guards, while in the very act of watching the tomb, had seen the angel roll back the stone, and on recovering from their fear had found the tomb empty. Thereupon they reported to the chief priests what had happened. "And they being assembled together with the ancients, taking counsel, gave a great sum of money to the soldiers, saying: Say you, His disciples came by night and stole Him away while we were asleep. And if the governor shall hear of this we will persuade him and secure you." By this ignoble conduct the Jewish authorities betrayed their embarrassment at an event which could not be ignored. Unable to deny the fact of the empty tomb, they sought to make current a false explanation.

Another proof that the enemies of Jesus recognized the tomb to be empty is to be found in their inability to refute the Apostles when they began on the day of Pentecost to proclaim in the very streets of Jerusalem that Jesus was risen from the dead. Had the tomb contained the body of Jesus there was at hand an easy, summary way of silencing the Apostles and of putting them to lasting

shame in the eyes of the people. This was to have the tomb opened and the body brought to view. The authorities did not take this simple means because it was not in their power. The tomb was empty.

IV. THE OBJECTIVE APPEARANCES OF THE RISEN LORD.

The empty tomb offers valuable indirect evidence in support of the apostolic preaching that Christ truly rose from the dead. But more important still is the direct evidence based on the experience of those who saw the risen Lord, conversed with Him and even touched Him. This evidence is to be found chiefly in the Gospels. St. Paul, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, enumerates it in a brief but important passage, of which we shall take account after we have reviewed the testimony recorded in the Gospels.

Numerous manifestations of the risen Lord are related in the Gospels, especially in the last two. The appearances recorded in Mark xvi., 9 ff., valuable as they may be on other grounds, are of little apologetic weight. It is the judgment of most non-Catholic critics and of some Catholic scholars like Fr. Rose, O. P., that these verses are a later addition to the original text. For this reason we shall confine our attention to the accounts in Matthew, Luke and John. Without attempting to harmonize the divergences of detail in the three evangelists, we shall enumerate the appearances as far as possible in chronological order.

1. The risen Lord appeared to the devout women near the tomb and spoke to them. They took hold of His feet and adored Him. (Mat. xxviii., 9-10.)

2. He appeared and spoke to Mary Magdalene, but would not let her touch Him. (John xx., 11-18.)[2]

3. He appeared to the two disciples, conversed with them and walked with them as far as Emmaus. While eating with them He vanished before their eyes. (Luke xxiv., 13-32.)

4. He appeared to Simon Peter. (Luke xiv., 33-34.)

5. He appeared to the assembled Apostles in the upper room, and to assure them that He was not a disembodied spirit, showed them His hands and feet, bade them touch Him, and ate before them. (Luke xxiv., 36-43, John xx., 19-20.)

The appearances thus far mentioned are recorded to have taken place on the very day of the resurrection.

6. He appeared to the assembled Apostles a week later and convinced the skeptical Thomas that He was truly risen by showing him His wounded hands and feet and side. (John xx., 24-29.)

[2] These two accounts, widely divergent though they be, may refer to one and the same experience.

7. He appeared to His disciples at the Sea of Galilee and ate and conversed with them. (John xx., 1-23.)

8. He appeared to the Apostles on a hill in Galilee. (Mat. xxviii., 16-20.)

9. He appeared to His disciples on Mount Olivet, whence He ascended to heaven. (Luke xxiv., 50-51, Acts i., 6-12.)

This imposing array of testimony has little weight with the skeptical critic of to-day. Besides suggesting that the disciples were innocent victims of hallucination, he seeks to discredit the genuineness of most of the testimony by relegating it to the rubbish heap of pious myth and legend. His eye is keen to note the discrepancies in the respective accounts which the four evangelists give of the visions. He bids us observe that the experience of Mary Magdalene and the other women at the tomb, as recorded by the first three evangelists, is absolutely inconsistent with the account in John of Mary's vision of the risen Lord. He notes that while the majority of the visions, related only by Luke and John, are said to have happened to the disciples in and about Jerusalem shortly after the resurrection—all others being excluded by Luke's alleged command of the risen Lord to His disciples: "But stay you in the city till you be indued with power from on high" (xxiv., 49)—Matthew and Mark, who represent the simpler, earlier tradition, know nothing of these Judaean visions and unconsciously bear witness against them; for their recorded message of the angel on the resurrection morn can have but one meaning, namely, that the Apostles did not see the risen Lord till after their return to the appointed meeting place in distant Galilee. "And going quickly, tell ye His disciples that He is risen; and behold He will go before you into Galilee; there you shall see Him. Lo, I have foretold it to you." (Mat. xxviii., 7, cf. xxvi., 32, also Mark xvi., 7, and xiv., 28.)

With the testimony in Luke and John thus reduced to mere fungous growths on the simpler tradition of the first two Gospels, the critic calmly disposes of the Galilean vision as an hallucination. But the testimony presented by the evangelists cannot thus lightly be set aside. Notwithstanding the difficulty, one might say the impossibility, of bringing into complete harmony the divergent accounts of the visions, one is not thereby justified in passing on all alike a sweeping condemnation. The same process of reasoning might be used with equal propriety to discredit the story of the crucifixion. Nor is it fair to set up the meagre account of the first two evangelists as if it contained all that was known in their day of the appearances of the risen Lord, and treat the ampler accounts in Luke and John as later, legendary developments.

In proof of this we have but to turn to the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, the genuineness of which cannot be questioned. In the fifteenth chapter, verses three to eight, we find a written record of appearances of the risen Lord that antedates all of the Gospels and that vouches in a striking way for the truth of the Judaean visions related by Luke and John. We read: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received: How that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the scriptures; and that He was seen by Cephas; and after that by the eleven.[3] Then He was seen by more than five hundred brethren at once, of whom many remain until this present, and some are fallen asleep. After that He was seen by James, then by all the Apostles. And last of all He was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time."

Leaving aside for the time being his own personal testimony, we find St. Paul declaring that the risen Lord appeared at least five times to His disciples; first to Cephas, then to the eleven, then to a group of five hundred disciples, then to James, then again to the assembled Apostles. The manner in which St. Paul enumerates these visions, using the time connectives *then, last of all,* seems to show that he had in mind a chronological arrangement. Hence the first two appearances mentioned, that to Cephas and that to the eleven, are in all probability identical with those mentioned by Luke and John as having occurred the day of the resurrection. It is not unlikely that the appearances to the five hundred disciples and to the apostolic group correspond with the Galilean visions, of which at least one is referred to in Matthew and Mark. The localizing of the visions is of minor importance. The chief thing to be noted is that St. Paul agrees with the evangelists in asserting that the disciples on several occasions saw the risen Lord.

The competency of St. Paul to speak with certitude of these wonderful experiences of the Apostles cannot be called in question. He had every opportunity to get his information first-hand. He tells us in his Epistle to the Galatians that on one occasion he spent fifteen days with Cephas and James in Jerusalem; that later on he again visited the holy city and conferred with the Apostles, especially with James and Cephas and John, to make sure that he was preaching the same Gospel as they. (Cf. i., 18-19, ii., 1-2, 9.) It is incredible that in these conferences the story of the resurrection should not have been rehearsed. He must have received from the Apostles themselves the accounts of the visions which he briefly ascribes to

[3] In the Greek text, "the twelve," a current designation of the apostolic band, unaffected by the lapse of Judas.

them. In addition, he records the notable appearance of Christ to more than five hundred brethren at one time, of whom the greater part were still alive when he wrote. One could hardly look for statements more positive and assuring. Through St. Paul we are introduced into the very presence of those who saw the risen Lord.

There is thus every reason to acknowledge the genuineness of the testimony of the original Apostles that they saw and conversed with the risen Lord. Are they thoroughly reliable witnesses?

If the only voucher for the appearance of Jesus in His glorified state were the testimony of the devout women mentioned in the Gospel story, one might be excused for doubting. Women in whom an emotional temperament is combined with a strong religious turn of mind have more than once been the victims of pious hallucination. And so, taken by itself, the testimony of the women that they saw the risen Lord would not be of much worth. But the same cannot be said of the testimony of the Apostles. They were, most of them, plain, prosaic, matter-of-fact men, taken from humble walks of life, trained by daily toil to be anything but dreamers.

Where subjective visions occur they presuppose a process of intense brooding on some favorite object of desire. Hence in whatever form the vision theory is set forth, it is assumed that the Apostles were in a state of great mental tension due to the persuasion that their crucified Lord could not be under the lasting dominion of death and to the corresponding expectation that He must rise again. This assumption is, as we have seen, in flat contradiction with the evidence. The Apostles were not looking for Christ's rising from the dead. They were amazed when told of the empty tomb. They received with cold skepticism the announcement of the women that Jesus was risen. Only when they saw Him themselves were they convinced.

Moreover, they saw the risen Lord under too great a variety of conditions and circumstances to leave any room for doubt. Jesus did not merely show Himself on one sole occasion. Nor did He simply appear at a distance like a spectre, and then vanish forever. The Apostles were convinced not only that they saw Him and heard Him, but that they touched Him, ate with Him, conversed with Him and thereby acquired a larger and truer conception of the kingdom and of their mission. It was not merely in the upper chamber, hallowed by the reminiscences of the Last Supper, that they had these experiences. It was in the little home at Emmaus, under the open sky of Galilee, on Mount Olivet. Now it was to Peter, now to James, now to the two disciples at Emmaus, now to the assembled Apostles lacking Thomas, now to all without excep-

tion, now to the seven at the Sea of Galilee, now to more than five hundred at one time.

It is hard to see how more convincing evidence could be offered to prove an event cognizable to the senses. Shall we, then, reject their testimony as purely fanciful because it implies a stupendous miracle? Can we logically admit the soberness of their judgment when it is question of the empty tomb, and deny the reality of their attested visions of the risen Christ, by which alone the empty tomb is explained? By evading the fact of the resurrection does not the critic land himself in a still greater difficulty, to account for the marvelous growth and influence of the Church of Christ on the basis of idle dreams?

CHARLES F. AIKEN, S. T. D.

Washington, D. C.

THE NEWLY DISCOVERED "SAYINGS OF JESUS."

IT IS now seven years ago, for it happened in 1897, that Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt found a first papyrus containing eight "Sayings of Jesus." The two archæologists were engaged in researches in Egypt under the direction of the Egypt Exploration Fund. About 120 miles south of Cairo, on the edge of the Libyan desert, a series of low mounds covered with Roman and early Arab pottery marks the site of the ancient capital of the Oxyrhyngus district. The wide area and the size of its ruins show the past grandeur and importance of the place. But Arab rule has reduced the populous city to a mere hamlet called Behnesa. In recent times it became known that Behnesa contains more than the scattered ruins of the Roman and early Christian Oxyrhynchus. Hunters of ancient Greek papyri discover in Egyptian Behnesa as many treasures as the seekers after gold find in the Arctic regions of Alaska. No wonder that diggers as experienced as Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt should find their way to the ruined city in order to turn the sandhills of the Libyan desert into eloquent witnesses for historical and doctrinal antiquity.

Their first three weeks of work were devoted to the ancient cemetery and proved fruitless. But the rubbish heaps of the town furnished large quantities of papyri, mainly Greek, ranging from the first to the eighth century and embracing every variety of subject. Probably Arsinoë is the only site of antiquity that has been more fertile in this respect. The most valuable among the finds was, no doubt, a leaf from a papyrus book, containing eight *Logia* or "Sayings of Jesus." The fragment was found in a mound which pro-

duced a great number of papyri belonging to the first three centuries of our era. The handwriting, too, was so characteristically Roman that it cannot be dated later than 300 A. D. On the other hand, the book form of the papyrus and the contractions it exhibits do not allow it to be placed in the first century. Its discoverers, therefore, have assigned it to the period 150-300 A. D. At the same time, the uncials of the fragment are far from exhibiting the latest type used before 300 A. D. It cannot be very wrong, therefore, to fix on the years about 200 A. D. as the most probable date of the manuscript.

In size the leaf measures 5¾x3¾ inches, though its broken lower end shows that the original height must have been somewhat greater. Several indications point to the inference that the leaf was so placed in its codex as to make its *verso* side come uppermost. The discoverers published and interpreted their find in the year 1897,[1] and before the end of the year 1898 quite a number of articles and monographs had dealt with the same subject.[2] The results of these investigations were: First, a reliable interpretation of the text; secondly, a clear outline of its relation to other remnants of early Christian literature.

Logion I. ". . . and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote that is in thy brother's eye."[3]

The reader will notice that the Saying agrees with Luke vi., 42, while it slightly differs from Matthew vii., 5. If the *verso* side of the leaf came first in the book, as it seems to have done, the whole text as found in St. Luke and St. Matthew may have preceded. If the *recto* side came first, the text of the evangelists must have appeared in an abbreviated form, since the lost lower margin could not hold the full text. The first Saying occupies line 1-4 of the fragment.

Logion II. "Jesus saith, Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God; and except ye keep the Sabbath, ye shall not see the Father."[4]

---

[1] Grenfell and Hunt, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part I.; in separate form, ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ : Sayings of Our Lord, London, 1897, Egypt Exploration Fund.

[2] Lock and Sanday, Two Lectures on the Sayings of Jesus, Oxford, 1897, Clarendon Press; Swete, The Oxyrhynchus Fragment, in Expository Times for September, 1897; Harnack, Ueber die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu, transl. in Expositor for Nov. and Dec., 1897; Zahn, Die jüngst gefundenen Aussprüche Jesu, in the Theol. Literaturblatt for Sept. 3 and 10, 1897; James. The New Sayings of Christ, and Rendel Harris, The Logia and the Gospels, in the Contemporary Review for Aug. and Sept., 1897; P. Batiffol, Les Logia du Papyrus de Behnesa, in the Revue Biblique for Oct., 1897; Abbott, The Logia of Behnesa, in the American Journal of Theology for Jan., 1898.

[3] . . . καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

[4] Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἐὰν νηστεύσητε τὸν κόσμον οὐ μὴ εὕρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσητε τὸ σάββατον οὐκ ὄψεσθε τὸν πατέρα.

In the first *Logion* we recognized a coincidence with the synoptic tradition; this second Saying is wholly new as far as its contents are concerned. The language is not so far removed from the phraseology of the Gospels as it seems to be at first sight. The conditional form in which the requisits for salvation are expressed reminds one of several passages in the Synoptic Gospels.[5] The phrase "kingdom of God" is too well known to the student of the Synoptists to need special mention. The expression "to find the kingdom" runs parallel to the formula "to seek the kingdom," which occurs in St. Matthew and St. Luke.[6] Finally, Harnack believes that the expression "to see the Father" reminds one rather of the Fourth Gospel[7] than either of the third or the first.[8]

What strikes one as peculiar in the second *Logion* is the metaphorical meaning of the two expressions, "to fast to the world" and "to keep the Sabbath." The former expression implies a renunciation of the world, the second a sanctification of the inner man; the former contains a negative element, the latter adds a positive duty. It is true that Luke xiv., 33, expresses the negative element with sufficient clearness; but the expression "the world" has a Johannine flavor,[9] and the clear opposition between "the world" and "the kingdom" is first met with in "the Shepherd" of Hermas.[10] The phrase "to fast to the world" does not occur in early Christian literature in the meaning it has in the second *Logion.* The metaphorical meaning of "Sabbath" may be traced back to Hebrews iv., 9; it finds its fuller development in the writings of Barnabas[11] and Justin Martyr.[12] And what shall we say after all this with regard to the genuineness of the *Logion?* The ideas it expresses are in agreement with the teaching of Christ, but its form has no accurate parallel in the accredited sources of Christ's spoken words.

Logion III. "Jesus saith, I stood in the midst of the world, and in the flesh was I seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them, and my soul grieveth over the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart [and they see not their] poverty."[13]

---

[5] Cf.Matthew xvi., 26; xviii., 3; Mark viii., 36; x., 15; Luke xvii., 33; xviii., 17.

[6] Matthew vi., 33; Luke xii., 31.

[7] John xiv., 9.

[8] Cf. Matthew xi., 25-27.

[9] Cf. I. John ii., 15.

[10] Sim. i.; cf. II. Clem. vi., 3 ff. and Pistis Sophia, Schwartze, p. 158.

[11] C. 15.

[12] Dial. 12; cf. 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27.

[13] Λέγει Ἰησοῦς ἔ[σ]την ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ κόσμου, καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ ὤφθην αὐτοῖς, καὶ εὗρον πάντας μεθύοντας καὶ οὐδένα εὗρον διψῶντα ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ πονεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου ἐπὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅτι τυφλοί εἰσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶ[ν καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν εἰς τ]ὴν πτωχείαν.

The ending of this Saying is somewhat uncertain, since it is quite illegible in the Greek fragment. Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt assume that a whole line has been lost after the expression "their heart"—this line would have been the last on page 1 of the papyrus—and that a new *Logion* began with the lost line and ended with the word "poverty" in line 1 on page 2 of the payrus. Harnack is of opinion that the space is too short for a new *Logion*. He does not admit the loss of a line, but advances the above conjectural supplement, "and they see not their poverty."

The aorists found in the introductory part of the *Logion*, "I stood," etc., suggest the hypothesis that the words were spoken by Jesus after His Ressurection. Such post-Resurrection speeches of the Lord are not uncommon in the apocryphal Gospels. But the present tense in the clause "my soul grieveth" supposes Jesus still in His mortal flesh. The Saying points, therefore, to a late period in Christ's public life. The thought expressed in the introductory clauses is parallel with Pauline and Johannine ideas.[14] Jesus speaks here as a divine being, reminding one of the prophetic words in Bar. iii., 38. In this respect the third *Logion* puts more explicit professions of His Divinity in the mouth of our Lord than does the Fourth Gospel.

The body of the Saying contains two main statements: First, men are lacking in susceptibility; secondly, Jesus Himself undergoes painful labor for their spiritual interest. The expression "drunken" may be compared with Matthew xxiv., 49; it has several parallels in the Old Testament. The absolute use of the verb rendered "athirst" occurs also in the Fourth Gospel,[15] but has no parallel in the Sermon on the Mount. The general expressions "all" and "none" must be understood as rhetorical conceits, after the manner of Matthew xiii., 37. The phrase "my soul grieveth" may have its origin in Is. liii., 10, though complaints about the blindness and unresponsiveness of men occur repeatedly in the Gospels.[16] These latter also testify repeatedly to the sorrow Jesus felt over the fruitlessness of His work.[17] The preposition which occurs in the Greek text after the verb "grieveth" has its parallel in Mark iii., 5, and the phrase "the sons of men" also reminds one of Mark iii., 28. Both preposition and phrase indicate the hebraising tendency of the *Logion*. The same may be said of the verb "to find," which occurs twice in the present Saying and once in both the second and the fourth.

[14] Cf. I. Timothy iii., 16; John i., 10, 11, 14.

[15] John vi., 35; vii., 37; xiv., 13-15.

[16] Cf. Matthew xv., 14 f.; xxiii., 16-26; John ix., 39 ff.

[17] Matthew xxiii., 37; xxvi., 38; Mark xiv., 34; Luke xix., 41; John xii., 27; cf. Act. Petr., Vercell. 10; Iren. I. xx., 2.

Considering the different parts of the *Logion* connectedly, we perceive that it unites the so-called Johannine and Pauline theology with the synoptic tradition, and this in such a way as to stand nearer to the synoptic tradition than does the Fourth Gospel. Harnack is of opinion that the early synoptic tradition developed in a dual course; one of these became the source of the Gospel according to St. John; the other of the Gospel from which the present *Logion* was taken.

Logion IV. "Jesus saith, wherever there are [two], they are not without God, and wherever there is one alone, I say, I am with him. Raise the stone, and there thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and there am I."[18]

This *Logion* presents two main difficulties; its beginning is mutilated and its meaning is obscure. It would lead us too far in a paper like the present to enter upon an investigation of the true original text. In our note we give the restoration of the Saying that has found favor in the eyes of most scholars; we need not say that the brackets in the Greek text indicate the portion restored by the editors of the *Logion.* But there is no such practical unanimity as to the meaning of the Saying. Bacon refers it to the ritual sacrifice: "Prepare an altar, pile up the stone, cleave the wood for fire, and I shall be there in your worship." Abbott and Schmiedel see in the "raising of stones" a reference to the children of Israel, and in the "cleaving of wood" they find a reminder of the barren tree of Pharisaic observance. James explains, "you must make an effort if you wish to find me."[19]

Barnes sees in the "stone" an allegory of the sepulchre, and in the "wood" a figure of the cross. Swete, too, has recourse to an allegory, "Christ is with the disciple who is a builder of Christianity." Even pantheistic and animistic explanations have been suggested, finding in the Saying evidence of God's or the soul's immanence in nature. The patrons of this latter opinion compare the Saying with an extract from the Gnostic "Gospel of Eve" as quoted by Epiphanius[20] or with certain expressions of the "Pistis Sophia."[21] Even the writings of St. Paul are laid under contribution in order to show the ubiquitous presence of Jesus.[22]

Leaving aside these extravagant views, we believe that Harnack, Lock, and Sanday have suggested a meaning which is substantially correct. The *Logion* insists on the fact that Christ will be with His

[18] [Λέγ]ει [Ἰησοῦς, ὅπ]ου ἐὰν ὦσιν [β οὔκ] ε[ἰσι]ν ἄθεοι, καὶ [ὅ]που ε[ἷς] ἐστιν μόνος, [λέ]γω, ἐγώ εἰμι μετ' αὐτ[οῦ.] ἔγει[ρ]ον τὸν λίθον κἀκεῖ εὑρήσεις με, σχίσον τὸ ξύλον κἀγῶ ἐκεῖ εἰμι.

[19] Cf. Matthew vii., 7.

[20] Haer. xxvi., 3.

[21] P. 145: ego sum isti, et isti sunt ego.

[22] Pph. iv., 6.

disciples everywhere, even in their daily toil. The second half of the Saying gives the concrete application of the general principle laid down in the first. We have here a parallel of Matthew xviii., 20, "where two or three are gathered together," etc.;[23] a still closer parallel is found in Tatian's "Diatessaron"[24] and in the passages alleged in Resch's "Paralleltexte zu Matthäus."[25]

The reader will, no doubt, be struck by the antithesis between our *Logion* and the words of Ecclesiastes:[26] "He that removeth stones, shall be hurt by them; and he that cutteth trees, shall be wounded by them." The student of the "Preacher" easily understands that this antithesis does not imply a contradiction between the inspired teaching of the Old Testament and that of the New. At the same time, it must be granted that the author of the *Logion*, whoever he be, implicitly refers to Ecclesiastes, though he gives a Greek rendering of the Hebrew text that differs from the Septuagint version. Finally, the clauses "they are not without God" and "I am with him" are evidently intended as parallels, so that Jesus is here again represented not only as God, but also as proclaiming His Divinity.

Logion V. "Jesus saith, A prophet is not acceptable in his own country, neither doth a physician work cures upon them that know him."[27]

The first half of the Saying is literally in agreement with Luke iv., 24, excepting the clause "a prophet is not," for which the evangelist reads "no prophet is." But Matthew xiii., 57, too, reads "a prophet is not," though he substitutes "without honor, save" instead of the word of the *Logion* "acceptable." Moreover, the first evangelist adds "and in his own house," while Mark vi., 4, presents the further addition "and among his own kindred." John iv., 44, simply says, "a prophet hath no honor in his own country." The second half of the Saying is new, but may be compared with Mark iv., 5: "And he could not do any mighty work there, only that he cured a few that were sick, laying his hands upon them," and also with the clause in Luke iv., 23, "physician, heal thyself." The phrase "they that know him" does not occur in the Gospels. On the whole, the sentiment expressed in the *Logion* is a sad one, and may be compared with *Logion* III. and with John i., 11, "he came unto his own, and his own received him not." No one will deny that Jesus may have uttered the thoughts contained in the Saying, seeing that it

[23] Cf. Matthew x., 29; John xiv., 23; viii., 29; xvi., 32.

[24] Zahn ,p. 169: "ubi unus est, ibi et ego sum."

[25] P. 233 f.

[26] x., 9.

[27] Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτ[ο]ῦ, οὐδὲ ἰατρὸς ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν.

harmonizes so closely with the Gospels, especially with that of St. Luke.

Logion VI. "Jesus saith, A city built upon the top of a high hill, and stablished can neither fall nor be hid."[28]

Matthew v., 14, offers a parallel to this *Logion* in the words "a city seated on a mountain cannot be hid." It is true that we notice here two discrepancies between the evangelist and the text of the fragment: "seated" instead of "built" and "on a mountain" instead of "upon the top of a high hill." But the first of these discrepancies is covered by the reading of Tatian's "Diatessaron"[29] and the Syriac version of Matthew.[30] The second may be compared with a passage in the Clementine Homilies.[31] The additional matter in the Saying reminds one of the parable of the house built upon a rock,[32] only there is no reference to the rock, which is the essential point of the parable.

Logion VII. "Jesus saith, Thou hearest with one ear [but the other thou hast closed].[33]

The editors of the fragment as well as its investigators agree that it offers here a Saying which has no parallel in the Gospels. The latter contain no *dictum* of our Lord beginning with the phrase "thou hearest." And what is more, scholars are far from being agreed as to the reading of the original Greek text of the Saying.[34]

After considering the *Logia* singly, Professor Harnack derives certain inferences from the data presented. (1) The fragment is no remnant of a Gospel from which our first and third Gospels are derived. For the Sayings, especially the third *Logion,* show too much of the Johannine character to be the prototype of the Synoptic Gospels. (2) The fragment is no part of Papias' *Logia* collection. His exegetical work is concerned with the Gospels, and it is only in the explanation of *gospel-dicta* that Papias introduces here and there Sayings of Christ derived from oral or written tradition. (3) The fragment is no extract from or part of a Gnostic Gospel. There is no trace in the *Logia* of Gnostic Dualism, or Doketism, or Pantheism; the emphasis laid on Christ's Divinity cannot be considered an unmistakable sign of Gnosticism. (4) The fragment is not a mere leaf torn out of an ancient Gospel, but it is a designedly

[28] Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, πόλις ᾠκοδομημένη ἐπ'ἄκρον [ὄ]ρους ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐστηριγμένη οὔτε πε[σ]εῖν δύναται οὔτε κρυ[β]ῆναι.

[29] Edit. Ciasca, p. 15a, Arab.

[30] Non potest civitas abscondi supra montem ædificata.

[31] III. 67; cf. Resch, Paralleltexte zu Matth., p. 68 f.

[32] Matthew vii., 24-25.

[33] Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἀκούεις [ε]ἰς τὸ ἓν ὠτίον σου, τὸ [δὲ ἕτερον συνέκλεισας].

[34] We need not remind the reader that Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt count eight Logia instead of seven. They divide our third Saying into two, so that from the fourth Logion their number is one in advance of ours.

prepared excerpt. This is shown by the disconnected character of the single Sayings and by the repetition of the introductory phrase "Jesus saith" before every *Logion.* Moreover, such solemn repetitions would not be found in a document intended for private use only. It must be added, however, that the Oxyrhynchus fragment does not seem to be the autograph of the excerpt. (5) It is certain that the excerpt has not been prepared from the canonical Gospels; though it is possible that the *Logia* are taken from different documents, it is most probable that they were chosen from one work resembling the synoptic tradition in its general character. Again, keeping in mind that this work is not Gnostic in its tendencies; that it resembles the canonical Gospels, and that the papyrus belongs to Egypt, being written early in the third century from a copy whose autograph dates back to the middle of the second century or to a period when the canonical Gospels had not yet reached their preëminent position, we must conclude that the *Logia* were excerpted either from the Gospel of Peter or the Gospel according to the Egyptians. And comparing the reasons for the former theory with those favoring the latter, it will be granted that the papyrus most probably exhibits excerpts from the Gospel according to the Egyptians.

The eight or rather seven Sayings thus far discussed were discovered by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt seven years ago. The learned archæologists might have discovered a second series of Sayings the very next season had they returned to Oxyrhynchus. But instead they spent some years in excavations at another locality, the Fayûm. Hence it was only in February, 1903, that they came upon another papyrus fragment of an additional five Sayings of Jesus, preceded by an important introduction. Only during the past summer has the public been favored with an official reproduction of the newly discovered Sayings and a discussion of their significance.[35] The introductory verse and the five Sayings constituting the second series of *Logia* are written on the back of a single papyrus fragment, the front of which contains a surveyor's record. This latter has been subjected to paleographical tests, and has been found to belong to about 250 A. D. It is, therefore, quite legitimate to infer that the copy of the Sayings belongs to the second half of the third century.

---

[35] Grenfell and Hunt, The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part IV., London, 1904, The Egypt Exploration Fund; Grenfell and Hunt, New Sayings of Jesus, and Fragments of a Lost Gospel, New York, 1904, Oxford University Press; Prof. Swete, The New Oxyrhynchus Sayings, in Expository Times for August, 1904, p. 488 ff.; Anonym., Church Quarterly Review for July, 1904; Heinrici, review of the editio princeps in Theol. Literaturzeitung for July 23, 1904; Mgr. Batiffol, in Revue Biblique for October, 1904.

The fragment containing the second series of *Logia* differs considerably from that containing the first. The first series was part of a papyrus book, the second is written on a papyrus roll. The text of the first series is on the whole fairly well preserved; the fragment containing the second series of Sayings has been cracked irregularly along the middle of the written page, so that the right half of each column is gone, taking with it about one-half of the text of each line. The left half of the lines is well preserved except at the bottom of the fragment, where the fifth Saying stands. The restoration of the broken lines is in several cases quite clear; in others it is wholly conjectural, so that different scholars will no doubt suggest different readings. Keeping in mind that the fragment contains forty-two lines, one easily sees that the difference between the various restorations is considerable. Only about four or five lines can be restored with some degree of confidence. We may infer from their length that each line must have averaged twenty-nine or thirty letters, or twelve syllables. This is the normal length of an iambic trimeter, one of the measures which professional scribes followed in dividing their matter into *stichi*.[36] Here the interpreter has a probable guidance for the restoration of the lines; for no line should considerably exceed twelve syllables or thirty letters. But even supposing that such words have been chosen as will supply the required number of letters and syllables, it is by no means certain that they are the right words. It is true that the surviving portions of each line suggest a certain interpretation, and such suggestions are the more valuable when they happen to coincide with known passages from early Christian sources. The papyrus was written about 250 A. D.; but it cannot be considered the autograph of the Sayings. According to the editors of the *Logia* the year 140 A. D. is the latest date to which the composition of the Sayings can be referred. The period between 100 and 140 A. D. is, therefore, the most probable time of their origin.

Introduction. "These are the [wonderful or true] Sayings which Jesus living [Lord, or who liveth and was dead] spake to [Judas] and Thomas, and he said unto [them, Every one that hearkens] to these words, shall in nowise taste [death]."[37]

The Greek text of the introduction presents peculiar difficulties to the interpreter. The very opening words are a puzzle that has not as yet been fully solved. The editors supply the epithet "wonderful" after the word "Sayings;" but Professor Swete and Mgr.

---

[36] Cf. Dr. Rendel Harris, Stichometry, p. 15 ff.

[37] Οἱ τοῖοι οἱ λόγοι οἱ [ἀληθινοὶ οὓς ἐλά]λησεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ ζῶν κ[αὶ ἀποθανὼν Ἰούδᾳ τῷ] καὶ Θωμᾷ. καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος Ὅστις] ἂν τῶν λόγων τούτ[ων ἀκούσῃ, θανάτου] οὐ μὴ γεύσηται.

Batiffol prefer the adjective "true." Again, after the particple "living" the noun "Lord" is supplied by the editors. But they avow that this restoration is rather doubtful. Professor Swete calls this combination "unusual, if not unprecedented," preferring the reading "who liveth and was dead," as suggested by more than one passage of the New Testament. Mgr. Batiffol is inclined to supply the adverb "secretly," seeing that the context suggests a private address of the Lord to the Apostles (Judas and) Thomas. The lacuna before "Thomas" may be filled in two different ways. Professor Lake reads "Judas Thomas," and his reading has been adopted by Professor Swete. This combination occurs in the Curetonian Syriac of John xiv., 22, in the "Acts of Thomas,"[38] and in the Syriac document quoted in a Greek translation by Eusebius.[39] Mgr. Batiffol believes the name of an apostle different from Thomas may be supplied, and he adds that Philip and Matthias usually accompany Thomas. Since Jesus has been styled "the living," it is natural that we should find a principle of life in what follows. It appears to be agreed on all sides that this principle is an adaptation of John viii., 51. The compiler of the Sayings must, therefore, have been quite well acquainted with the Johannine writings.

Logion I. "Jesus saith, Let not him who seeks [the Father] cease until he find [him]; and when he finds he shall be astonished; and being astonished he shall reign, and reigning shall rest."[40]

At the beginning of the Saying the editors supply the phrase "Jesus saith." The vacant space is satisfied with this restoration, and the analogy of the following *Logia* demands it. The substance of the Saying is familiar to the student through its use by Clement of Alexandria.[41] He first cites the second half of the Saying from the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but a second time he gives the whole Saying. Even here he leaves the verb "seeks" without its object, so that his wording reminds one of Matthew vii., 7. The papyrus exhibits a vacancy that cannot be filled by the Greek equivalent of the English word "until;" hence the editors suggest the insertion of the noun "life." Professor Swete prefers the insertion of either "God" or "the Father," while Mgr. Batiffol supplies only the pronoun "me," thus furnishing us a parallel of John vii., 34, "you shall seek me, and shall not find me." According to Professor Swete the exigencies of the vacant space in the next line require the imperative "let him be astonished" rather than the future "he shall be astonished." The imperative also agreees more perfectly with

[38] 11; cf. Burkitt, Journal of Theological Studies, p. 280 ff.

[39] Hist. Eccl. i., 13.

[40] [Λέγει Ἰησοῦς,] μὴ πανσάσθω ὁ ζη[τῶν . . . . . ἕως ἂν] εὕρῃ καὶ ὅταν εὕρῃ [θαμβηθήσεται καὶ θαμ]βηθεὶς βασιλεύσει κα[ὶ βασιλεύσας ἀναπα]ήσεται.

[41] Strom. II., ix., 45; V. iv., 97.

the foregoing phrase "let not him . . . cease." In the light of the New Testament[42] the astonishment here mentioned indicates the rush of mingled fear and joy which will follow the great find of life, the discovery of God.

Logion II. "Jesus saith, [Ye ask, who are those] that draw us [to the kingdom, if] the kingdom is in heaven? [They that are on earth, and] the birds of the heaven, [and all beasts] that are under the earth [or upon the earth, and] the fishes of the sea, [these are they which draw] you; and the kingdom [of heaven] is within you, [and whoever shall] know [himself] shall find it. [For if you shall truly] know yourselves, [you shall also know that sons] you are of the [almighty] Father, and you shall know yourselves [to be] in [the city of God], and you ar the [city]."[43]

This second Saying is new and rather hard to understand. Professor Swete finds the key to its meaning in the word "to draw." The Greek equivalent of the verb occurs only twice in the New Testament,[44] and in both cases it has the meaning of dragging a resisting body. The moral influence on the soul of a person is expressed by a different form of the verb.[45] But other writers employ the Greek verb as it is found in the papyrus in the sense of exercising a moral influence.[46] Supposing this to be the real sense of the verb in our Saying, we detect in it an allusion to Jesus' words concerning the birds of the air and the lilies of the field.[47] The passage, therefore, does not establish the common place contrast, "the kingdom is in heaven, but you are drawn to this earth;" it rather agrees with St. Paul's teaching that "the invisible things of him . . . are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made."[48] But the kingdom of God is not only in heaven, it is also within men. This thesis and its natural inference are inculcated in the second half of the Saying.

While the general outline of the meaning contained in the Saying is fairly well agreed upon, its details give rise to a great variety of opinions. Perhaps the main discussion is concerned with the insertion of the epithet "Almighty" after the noun "Father" and the

---

42 Mark x., 24; xiv., 33; Acts iii., 10.

43 Λέγει Ἰ[ησοῦς, ... τίνες] οἱ ἕλκοντες ἡμᾶς [εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰ] ἡ βασιλεία ἐν οὐρα[νῷ ἐστιν; . . . . .] τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρ[ανοῦ καὶ τῶν θηρίων ὅ]τι ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν ἐστ[ιν ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ] οἱ ἰχθύες τῆς θαλά[σσης οὗτοι οἱ ἕλκον]τες ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἡ βασ[ιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν] ἐντὸς ὑμῶν [ἐ]στι [καὶ ὅστις ἂν ἑαυτὸν] γνῶ ταύτην εὑρή[σει . . . . .] ἑαυτοὺς γνώσεσθε [καὶ εἰδήσετε ὅτι υἱοὶ] ἐστε ὑμεῖς τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ τ[. . . . .] γνώσεσθε ἑαυτοὺς ἐν[. . . . .] καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐστέ ἥπτο[. . . . .].

44 Acts xxi., 30; James ii., 6.

45 *E. g.*, John vi., 44.

46 IV. Mach. xiv., 13; Clem. Al., Strom. VII., ii., 9.

47 Matthew vi., 26.

48 Romans i., 20.

use of "city" in the last lines. The phrase "Father Almighty" has no parallel in the New Testament and the Septuagint version, though the epithet occurs in connection with "Lord" and "God." Still the expression "Father Almighty" might have been suggested by St. Paul's words, "and I will be a father to you, and you shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."[49]

It is Professor Blass who first suggested the reading "you are the city;" the abruptness and strangeness of the words in their context as well as the archaic spelling of the Greek original for "city" make against the correctness of the suggestion. But the thought cannot be said to be unknown to the Gospels or even to the first series of Oxyrhynchus Sayings. It is allied to St. Matthew's city placed upon a mountain, and to the expressions "you are the salt of the earth," "you are the light of the world."

Logion III. "Jesus saith, A man shall not hesitate . . . to ask . . . concerning his place [in the kingdom. Ye shall know] that many that are first shall be last, and the last first, and [they shall have eternal life]."[50]

The restoration of the third Saying is most difficult. The second half agrees so well with Mark x., 31, that its interpretation cannot be very doubtful. And since the words discourage undue confidence in reference to the final reward, Professor Swete suggests the ending "and few shall find it" instead of the editors' interpretation, "and they shall have eternal life." In the first half of the Saying, too, all would be simple if the papyrus did not exhibit any gaps, but presented only the words of which we are now certain, "a man will not hesitate to inquire about the place." Now, either side of the infinitive "to inquire" presents a gap that must be filled with words, two of which are more closely determined by their last syllable and one by its first syllable. Professor Swete suggests the restoration "a man will not hesitate to inquire boldly about the seasons." The last phrase is suggested to him by Mark xiii., 33, "ye know not when the time is," and by Acts i., 7, "it is not for you to know the times or moments." Finally, the middle portion of the *Logion* is interpreted by Professor Swete as meaning "prating of the place of glory." In the Greek participle he finds a parallel to Luke xxiv., 11; "the place" is illustrated by John xiv., 2, and Acts i., 25; finally, the expression "glory" has its equivalent in John xvii., 22.

Logion IV. "Jesus saith, Everything that is not before thy face and that which is hidden from thee shall be revealed to thee. For

---

[49] II. Cor. vi., 18.

[50] Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, οὐκ ἀποκνήσει ἄνθ[ρωπος . . . . .] ρων ἐπερωτῆσαι πα[. . . . .]ων περὶ τοῦ τόπου τῆ[ς . . . . .] σετε ὅτι πολλοὶ ἔσονται π[ρῶτοι ἔσχατοι καὶ] οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ [. . . . .] σιν.

there is nothing hidden which shall not be made manifest, or buried which shall not be raised."[51]

This Saying is a blending of Matthew x., 26, and Luke viii., 17, so that it agrees with the synoptic tradition. At the same time, it exhibits a distinctively Johannine word in the Greek original of the noun "face;" besides, the ending may refer to John v., 28 f., "all that are in the graves shall . . . come forth." But it is quite possible that the ending alludes to Matthew xiii., 44, "the kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hidden in a field." It appears not to have been uncommon in Palestine to bury a treasure in the ground for the sake of security. Even now the spade of the laborer at times unearths such hidden treasures. In this connection the Saying states "nothing is buried which shall not be raised."

Logion V. "His disciples enquire of him and say, How shall we fast? and how shall we [pray? and how are we to give alms? and of such duties] also what are we to observe? Jesus saith, [See that you lose not your reward.] Do nothing [save the things that] belong to the truth, [for if you do these, ye shall know a hidden mystery. I say unto you,] Blessed is he [. . .]."[52]

The textual condition of this last *Logion* is so wretched that the editors have not attempted a restoration. The above English rendering follows the interpretation of Professor Swete. The reader will readily perceive the subject of the Saying. The disciples question Jesus, and He answers, quite after the manner of the Synoptic Gospels. The question must have arisen out of an instruction on almsgiving, prayer and fasting. We find something similar, if not identical, in the Sermon on the Mount. Still it may be seen how uncertain Professor Swete's restoration is, if we compare it with that published by Mr. Barnes in the *Guardian* July 20, 1904. For the latter seems to find in the Saying a parallel to Matthew xix., 16-22, and Luke xviii., 18-22, interpreting the end of the *Logion*, "and what must we observe in order to have life? Jesus saith, Do not act as the hypocrites. For they oppose the way of the truth, and they lose the hidden reward. And blessed is he for whom there is a reward in heaven."

After reviewing the two series of *Logia* we may ask whether they may be regarded as two distinct parts of the same collection. Whatever view the editors may have defended, Mgr. Batiffol denies that the two series belong to one work. Here are his reasons: 1. It

---

[51] Λέγει Ἰησοῦς, [πᾶν τὸ μὴ ἔμπροσ[θεν τῆς ὄψεώς σου καὶ [τὸ κεκρυμμένον] ἀπὸ σοῦ ἀποκαλυφθήσετ[αί σοι. οὐ γάρ ἐσ]τιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανε[ρὸν γενήσεται] καὶ τεθαμμένον ὃ ο[ὐκ ἐγερθήσεται].

[52] [Ἐξ]ετάζουσιν αὐτὸν ο[ἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ λέ]γουσιν. πῶς νηστεύ[σομεν καὶ πῶς . . . . .]μεθα καὶ πῶς [. . . . . κ]αὶ τί παρατηρήσ[ομεν . . . . .]ν; λέγει Ἰησοῦς, [. . . . .]ειται μὴ ποιεττ[ε . . . . .]ης ἀληθείας ἀν[. . . . .]ν ἀ[π]οκεκρ[υ . . . . . μα]κάρι[ός] ἐστιν [. . . . .]ω ἐστ[ι . . . . .]ιν [. . . . .].

is by no means certain that the *Logia* of 1904 are part of an extensive collection; the papyrus may have been intended as a kind of phylactery. 2. The Sayings of 1897 were uniform in their use of the phrase "Jesus saith," while those of 1904 do not present the same uniformity. 3. The *Logia* of 1897 were found to be related to the Gospels of St. Matthew, St. Luke and St. John, but not to the Gospel according to the Hebrews. 4. Finally, the Sayings of 1897 are called *Logia*, those of 1904 are called *Logoi*.

Moreover, the Sayings of 1904 appear to stand wholly outside the field of investigation concerning the *Logia*-collections properly so-called. These latter precede, according to our present-day criticism, our Synoptic Gospels and were utilized by the evangelists as sources. They certainly did not derive their authority from the name of an Apostle, be it St. Thomas or any other. The method of appealing to an Apostle's name agrees with the mental attitude of the second century, the century of pseudo-apostolic apocryphal writings. It is, therefore, the Introduction of the 1904 *Logia* that assigns them to a post-apostolic age.

And here again it may be asked whether the collection presents detached and sporadic Sayings, or extracts from extra-canonical Gospels that circulated in the second century. Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt incline towards the former of these alternatives, mainly on account of the negative argument that we cannot be certain from what extra-canonical Gospel the Sayings were chosen. The *Logia* contain, on the one hand, a quotation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and on the other they present a Johannine coloring incompatible with the Gospel to the Hebrews. Shall we say, therefore, that the Sayings of 1904 were chosen from different sources? This hardly agrees with the words of the Introduction, in which the Sayings are derived from the Lord's manifestations made to St. Thomas. Mgr. Batiffol points out that this argument does not prove. The Introduction is not necessarily the work of the compiler; most probably it was copied just as the Sayings were excerpted. Again, the Johannine coloring in the Sayings of 1904 may be reduced to the phrase "shall not taste death," a phrase that might have been employed even by an opponent of the writings of St. John.

When Mgr. Batiffol comes to state his own opinion as to the origin of the Sayings, he refers us to Professor Sanday's view as to the origin of the *Logia* published in 1897. They are a product of the first half of the second century; they do not spring directly from our canonical Gospels, but from conditions of thought created by the canonical Gospels. Professor Swete modifies this view to a certain extent: "While it is possible that certain of the Sayings were excerpted from non-canonical Gospels, there is no convinc-

ing evidence that this was so; it is open to us to believe that the compiler was indebted wholly or chiefly to the floating traditions of the second century—traditions based on the recollections of those who had heard the Lord, or who, like Papias, had made it their business to inquire from survivors of the first generation what the Apostles and other disciples had said about Him."

Are the two series of Sayings to be regarded as conveying the actual words of Jesus? More than one-half of their contents is duplicated in the canonical Gospels; of this portion of the Sayings we need not treat here. The rest is certainly commended to our confidence by its company. Not as if these Sayings contained the very words of Jesus; they certainly exhibit more modifications of the actual utterances of Jesus than we meet with in the canonical Gospels. But it is not at all unreasonable to suppose that they go back to original utterances of Jesus, and that they reproduce in Greek with considerable faithfulness thoughts which Jesus uttered in Aramaic. Professor Swete modifies this view to some extent: "The Sayings must be judged severally, each on its own merits, without regard to the order in which they stand or their supposed connection with a particular Apostle. So judged, they will be found, I venture to think, not wholly unworthy of the Supreme Teacher of mankind."

And do the Sayings teach us anything that is really new concerning the person or the doctrine of Jesus? There is nothing sensational in the *Logia*, nothing that changes our view of Jesus or our interpretation of His teaching. Our faith and our principles of Christian morality are not at all affected by the discovery. At the same time, the Christian apologist and archæologist find their respective field of work enlarged. The practical moralist, too, finds certain applications of revealed principles in the Sayings that were not formerly regarded as directly emanating from Jesus. Nature and the animal life about us, we are told, speak of God and draw us to Him; the kingdom of God is within us, and we shall find it by self-knowledge. These thoughts are in harmony with Jesus' teaching, but they are not expressly stated in the Gospels.[53]

A. J. Maas, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

[53] The Logia are not the only gospel-material discovered by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt. They have also brought to light a small roll containing part of a gospel hitherto wholly unknown. The writing appears to belong to the third century; lines 1-16 contain the end of a discourse of Jesus similar to the Sermon on the Mount; lines 17-23 give a question of the disciples and an answer of the Master; the remaining portion is almost entirely undecipherable. The following is a translation of what can be read: "[Take no thought] from morning until evening, nor from evening until morning, either for your food what ye shall eat, or for your raiment what ye shall put

A PROVENÇAL RENASCENCE.

IT IS a strange fact that a literary impulse should originate in a source associated with the forces of war and destruction. We live in an age of anomalies, sometimes more glaring than any ever invented by the fantastic contrivers of "Pinafore," "Patience" and other musical satires of a harmless school. Millionaires, rich as Crœsus, displaying a feverish anxiety to discover means of dissipating the riches they had shown a still more feverish anxiety to gain, form one of its distinctive claims to novelty. Inventors of death-dealing agencies in war—labor-saving contrivances in shambles work, as they may be sarcastically described—are seen in the temple of Peace, mildly presiding over schemes for the encouragement of learning and science and philosophy. A good case in illustration is the Nobel prize scheme in Sweden; another hardly less striking is the system of Rhodes scholarships. Mr. Nobel made his immense fortune by his discoveries in the realm of deadly explosives; and Mr. Rhodes in contriving the extinction of the South African Dutch Republics. They are two typical benefactors of the human race, as modern ideals go. But we must make allowances for a little incongruity; no age is perfection, and it may not be otherwise in our generation.

The Nobel foundation is one of the most generous ever devised. It fixes no limits as to race or language or country in the awarding of its prizes. Supreme excellence in the intellectual sphere is the sole test of merit. The truly catholic spirit of the foundation is shown in the fact that the prize went last year to two literary men who do not belong to Sweden, the country of the founder. It was divided between Frédéric Mistral, a representative Provençal poet and enthusiast for the past, and Don Jose Echegaray, a famous dramatic author of Spain. The award is a singular one, many will think; but the judges who made it do not travel in the beaten paths. Literature has many sides, and some of these are unknown to many who talk and write the most profoundly on the subject, as though the field were their exclusive property.

Although Mistral represents an anachronism, he is a very inter-

---

on. Ye are far better than the lilies which grow but spin not. Having one garment, what do ye [lack]? Who could add to your stature? He himself will give you your garment. His disciples say unto him, when wilt thou be manifest to us, and when shall we see thee? He saith, When ye shall be stripped and not be ashamed. . . . He said, The Key of knowledge ye hid; ye entered not in yourselves, and to them that were entering in ye opened not."

esting figure. He is the embodiment of an ideal. Were one to back to life the figures in the fading canvases and put flesh and blood into the suits of war harness that stand in rows along the walk down the corridor of an ancient feudal castle and could conjure floor, the speech and action of these would be not less out of place with the conventions of to-day than the literature and art that Mistral seeks to perpetuate and glorify.

Yet it had its period of glory, more lasting and wiespread in its cult than many of those that rose, only to sink unmourned, since the doctrine of the beautiful mother-cult of all, that of the imperishable Greek. For more than three centuries the witchery of the Provençal vogue held all civilized Europe enthralled, and, by means of the Crusades, had made itself known even in the East. It was the poetical and literary and musical expression of all that was understood by the word "chivalry." And yet when it had attained its full flower, it went the way of all flowers that are suffered to run to seed. From the sublime and knightly it deteriorated into the erotic and the frivolous. Yet even in this debased form it preserved a peculiar grace and a false winsomeness that irresistibly appeals to the less robust and judicious in mental leanings—just as Watteau, with his pretty shepherdesses and courtier-like swains, appeals to a certain order of connoisseurs in art more powerfully than the creations of Cimabue or Michael Angelo ever could.

The Provençal dialect stands in much the same relation to the grand Latin mother tongue as the Italian dialect adopted by Dante in his poetical work. Provence by its name tells of its own origin. It was the old Roman "Province" par excellence—the direct offshoot of the masterful Commonwealth when it was in the heyday of its colonizing fever. In the far away days the strict and sonorous Latin was spoken there in purity as exacting as in Rome itself, but gradually a change came, as in Italy. The "barbarian" began to make himself felt in even the sphere of letters and refinement. The Celtic speech, the tongue of the common people all over Gaul, ate into the Latin of the conquerors, in the South as well as in the North of France, producing the *langue d'Oc* and the *langue d'Oil*. Of the former the Provençal was the direct offspring; of the other the Walloon. Norman French left no literature, save legal enactments and royal charters in England, and certain phrases that may still be seen as notices to visitors in the great Norman keep of the Tower of London and certain cartularies in ancient abbeys of Norman foundation. The Provençal is still a spoken dialect over a considerable area of the South, but its use is confined to the common people. Mistral and some other lovers of the old tongue are doing much to instil an enthusiasm for it, and all it represents,

among the better classes. These efforts coincide with the movement in Ireland to restore the old Gaelic tongue. But in the one case it is a dialect that its lovers would reanimate, while the other seeks for the restoration of a full-blooded language, the oldest probably now extant. There is hardly any just comparison between the respective literatures. While both are imaginative and artistic, the one is the grandeur of the tragic stage, the other the dalliance of the comic operetta and the forced witticism of the court jesters. Yet, if the proper study of mankind be man, literature, no matter of what sort or quality, must ever be worthy the study of the scholar and the thinker, because literature represents not merely a school of speech and grammatical form, but a field of thought and the action of ideas upon the formation of character and social life. The influence of climate and environment in shaping the tone and imagery of literature, whether in poetry or prose, is a question that may also be usefully considered when pondering over the respective revivals, or attempted revivals, by the shores of the Atlantic and by the Mediterranean seaboard. Provence, being a territory of sunshine and flowers and soft, languorous breezes, must have ever appealed to all that is sensuous in man or maid. Ireland is of a harder texture, both as to climate and soil. While it is rich, it offers that variety in look and mood that indicates how nature relies on opposites to produce her choicest effects in either mind or physique.

However wide the disparity, the temperament of poets in regard to worldly matters appears to be much the same. Mistral has no sense of thrift; he turns over his Nobel prize to the public use in his beloved Provence, whose representative museum at Arles already contains much of his personal store invested in the purchase of quaint works illustrating her old arts and sciences, her old fancies in bric-a-brac, her old solid style of furniture building, her old adherence to all that conjoined the useful with the beautiful. Your true poet owns no kinship with your miser or even your man of ordinary prudence; he is ever a heedless spendthrift who takes no thought of the morrow, but trusts in God as innocently as do the birds.

The *langue d'Oc* was not confined to French territory; it existed over large portions of Spain, notably Aragon, Navarre and Castile. When this parlance began no one can affirm; it is older than the history of those regions. In the Balearic Isles, where it also prevailed, it existed as a common vehicle of thought down to the eighteenth century, according to Bastero, a learned antiquarian, who wrote on the subject in the year 1724. It was kept alive, and finally brought into a state of elegance by means of the tribe of

wandering minstrels—a class who at length obtained definite recognition south of the Loire as Troubadours, and north of it, in France, as Trouveres. In most civilized countries literature and poetry had their origin in the common impulse of mankind to hear a story or listen to a song. The nomadic poet was to be found in every European country from Hellas to the Hebrides, ages before the advent of the missionary of the Gospel. In Celtic lands especially he became an institution. In Roman time he flourished in Gallia and Iberia, but the severe dignity of the Latin writer would not permit him to recognize one who merely sought to amuse where he felt it his duty to chronicle hard facts. Thus there is no mention of the class in the histories until after the eighth century, when they are slightingly referred to as either *joculatores, ministrales, scuriæ, mimi* and similar semi-scornful terms—showing that they filled the rôle of buffoons or jesters or circus clowns, as we understand these avocations, for a very long period ere they took on the airs of respectability and evolved the class of rhymers and chroniclers of romantic chivalry. In the Middle Ages they were generally classified as *jongleurs*—a term which furnished us with the modern appellation, juggler, and intimates that the wandering minstrel was a sort of variety performer whose *metier* included sleight-of-hand and feats of equilibrium as well as story-telling. From the *jongleurs* also came the race of court jesters. The minstrels, who formed another branch of the same stock, were in many cases rhymers as well as performers on the lute and harp. They introduced rhyme-endings, according to several authorities; as before their time the classic Latin looked only for rhythm and quantity in poetical composition, caring nothing for assonance. Mediæval Latin, however, departed from this severe tradition, doubtless finding that the rhymed endings made the musical services of the Church more popular and so more effective for the Church's great mission. It may be doubted, however, whether the Provençal minstrels were really the inventors of the new departure in poetry, inasmuch as very early poems in Irish were composed according to that system. It is claimed by some authors that the Irish poets were the first to invent and introduce the rhymic method in the gentle art. If this claim be well founded, it is not improbable that Languedoc borrowed the idea from Erin, since there was considerable intercourse between France and Ireland even at that very remote period. The wandering minstrel of the South had his prototype or counterpart in the wandering bard or *filcadh* of the Green Isle—a very much more robust and aggressive personage, according to many historians, however, than the gentle troubadour or trouvere of Southern Gaul.

In tracing the operative factors of post-Roman civilization, it will be found that the wandering poets and minstrels played probably the most important part of any. Going about from camp to camp and from castle to cottage, they formed a social link that bound all classes in a common tie of friendship and patriotism. They brought sunshine and gaiety wherever they went. They were ever the children of mirth and joyous camaraderie. No doubt the jests might at times, to our modern ears, sound coarse, but they were usually witty, and early manners knew nothing of the artificial delicacy of a more refined age. Sometimes the *jongleur* or minstrel was a potent agency in war. Those who came with the Northmen used to hearten the marching warriors by the fierce chant of Rollo's battle hymn; and we read of William of Normandy going to the tryst at Hastings preceded by the *jongleur* Taillifer who dexterously tossed his sword into the air and caught it falling, as he chanted the same ominous note of barbarous conquest.

There is no reliable date for the beginning of Troubadour poetry. It is pretty certain, however, that in its earliest form it was a crude and formless sort of folk-lore passed on from one generation to another. The popular taste was satisfied by the style which until lately in Ireland was set by the race called "ballad singers"—a rancous loud-lunged set, who sang or roared, solus or in duet, rambling "lamentations" or satires like "The Peeler and the Goat," to airs distorted from the inimitable masterpieces of Irish music. But a change set in about the twelfth century. Manners took on a refinement previously unknown; a taste for the æsthetic began to show in the growing dawn of a great awakening. The coarse and rugged rhymes would no longer satisfy the aspiring mind. It was the spirit of knighthood which gave the upward impulse; and it was in the promptings of religion that this spirit had its source. The Crusades brought this new life into Europe—a life that was destined in a short time to renovate all things, in art, in letters, in song. The spirit of chivalry demanded a freer exercise of hospitality. Open house was kept by the great feudal lords, and minstrel and *jongleur* were encouraged to essay a higher art by rich presents from prince and baron—gay apparel, fine steeds and liberal largesse. The poet began now to be a man of consequence, where formerly he was tolerated as an inevitable but amusing sort of "poor relation." So enviable became the position of the strolling caterer that it excited the envy of the more regular class of poets. We learn from the work of Friedrich Diez, a great German authority on Troubadour poetry, how this sentiment of jealousy sometimes found expression. He quotes some lines of Philip Mouskes, a Norman poet of the thirteenth century, bearing on the subject:

Quar quant li buens rois Charlemaine
Ot tout mise a son demaine
Provence qin mult est plentive
De vins, de bois, d'aigue, de rive,
As leceours, as menstreux
Qui sont au ques luxurieux
Le donna toute e departi.

This bit of Norman-French is thus translated: "When Charlemagne had brought all countries under his dominion, he made over and divided the whole of Provence, which is rich in wine, woods and rivers, among the luxurious musicians and minstrels."

For a couple of centuries from that epoch of prosperity the Troubadour's lot was a happy one. But thenceforward it began to feel the tooth of change. The immense expense incurred by the nobles in the Crusades, and the gradual encroachment of the town burgher class upon the power of the feudal nobility diminished the resources which enabled Kings, princes and nobles to give generous encouragement to the civilizing and softening art of the poet and the musician. When Dante arose the race of Troubadours had almost died out. He makes mention of some of the earlier celebrities in his "Divina Commedia," but nowhere refers to contemporary stars. So we may conclude, perhaps, that none were then visible in the poetical firmament. But it is undeniable that it was from the Troubadours that chivalry came into Italy. Books of chivalry were in great demand in Europe, especially in Spain, for long after the disappearance of the Troubadours from the stage; nor did the taste for reading these stilted productions cease until Cervantes arose to kill the noble hedonism by his solemn ridicule.

The art of the Troubadours was not confined to music and poetry; it also included elocution. The age being not a learned one, few understood the art of reading properly. Hence the scholars who could read and write with faultless precision were very highly esteemed by their less gifted auditors. To read the poetry and the romances of chivalry with such emphasis and sympathy as to move the hearts of knights and fair dames was an accomplishment diligently cultivated by the brilliant sons of song. This function was more particularly discharged by the jongleurs than by the Troubadours; but it often happened that the same individual was an adept in all.

As the art of the Troubadours grew into favor year after year, so did its quality become more and more refined. It was not merely the common people who hung upon their poetry and their romances, not merely knights and noble ladies, but even royalty itself became their munificent patrons and was even found in their ranks. Several monarchs belonged to them. Alfonso of Aragon was one; King Richard of England another, according to some

chroniclers of the age of the Crusades. Kings Peter the Second and Third and Alfonso the Ninth ((all of Aragon) also favored them highly; the Counts of Provence and Barcelona were their steadfast friends for many years. At the Papal Court in Avignon they were always welcome; indeed their decline synchronized very nearly with the departure of that court for Rome. The gradual loss of wealthy patrons was the immediate cause of the decline of the Troubadour's art.

Much is claimed for the influence of the Pagan Renascence upon literature and art. Savonarola denounced it as the harbinger of the material and the sensual. Certainly the age of romance in poetry and literature was the age of the ideal. Although in the beginning of the Provençal cult there was a large strain of sensuality, gradually the truer notion of the beautiful prevailed over the merely erotic, and when the great passion of the Crusades swept over Europe the height of religious emotion inspired the song of the Troubadour to its best flights. Historians of the Provençal movement divide its poetry into two principal classes—the love songs and the satirical and warlike lays, which they called *sirventes.* The sirvente was sub-divided again into three kinds—the political, the moral and the personal. The first deal with the affairs of the world at large and of Provence in especial; the second satirized the vices and follies of the time, and the third related to individual or personal concerns of a minor nature. Elegies on the death of patrons, or eulogies if alive, were also classified under the head of *sirventes.* There was one other very favorite form of poetry, called the *tenson.* This was a composition in the shape of a dialogue, wherein one party took up and challenged the propositions of the other. The theme was usually of love and the problems and considerations arising out of that passion. There was much subtle casuistry and intricacy displayed in the attack and the defense alike; and often the treatment of the subject was such as would not bear translation into modern English, for polite ears. That they were listened to without a qualm by noble knights and dames of the choicest caste, in the earlier centuries of a civilization that was regarded as refined only proves that there was a different standard and a simpler point of view—and mayhap an honester one—from what is now held by the *illuminati.* There was also an air of artificiality in many of the amorous compositions, imparted for the purpose of conveying the idea that the phraseology and the imagery were not indicative of any more than a poetical indulgence in an imaginary passion—a passing platonism affected out of gallantry and a chivalric conventionality. Thus it was not regarded as im-

proper in a married lady to accept the poetical compliments of a Troubadour, inasmuch as there was no real homage intended. But there were many cases where this conventionalism masked a guilty passion, and often a terrible tragedy put a period to the song and the singer, and mayhap to his *inamorata* as well.

Tensons were usually in the nature of double or duet poems. Each verse contained a proposition, affirmative or otherwise, that was answered in the succeeding verse. The tenson not infrequently assumed a form that might be described as poetical dialectics or casuistry. It debated such fine points as "which are the greater, the pleasures or the pains of love?" "Must a woman do as much for her lover as he for her?" and so on. In these days many of the questions debated in the tensons would be regarded as indelicate; in the times when they were composed they did not shock, since under the artificial code of chivalry which succeeded the real one a latitude was permitted in the discussion of morals much the same as between doctor and patient or lawyer and client in our own days.

Several other metrical forms were embraced in the Troubadours' curriculum. There was the *Chanson*, the *Son*, or *sonet*, the *Alba*, the *Serena* and the *Planh*, or elegy—all of which had their set form of rhythm and metre. Of these various ancient forms the *sonet*, or modern sonnet, is the principal survivor. The character of the *planh*, or elegy, may be, perhaps, judged of by the famous poem on the death of Sir John Moore, which is said by some critics to be an English adaptation of an old Norman composition on the death of a gallant Crusader. In the same way the stirring French air and poem, "Partant pour la Syrie," would seem to be an inheritance from the days of the Troubadours—a good specimen of the more martial class of the sirventes.

In Walter Scott's wild and semi-crazed romance, "Anne of Geierstein," much space is devoted to this phase of Provençal literature, and some revolting instances are cited in illustration of the baneful effects of "metaphysical" or platonic attachments such as subsisted between noble ladies and their Troubadour cavaliers. It should be remembered, however, that exaggeration in many things was a necessary part of Scott's art. This tendency is especially noticeable in his dissertations and notes on the Troubadours, and it degenerates into the extravagant in the picture he draws of King Réné of Anjou, in the same novel. Other literary artists have treated the same theme and with more historical fidelity, we would be inclined to opine. Scott presents us with a mad monarch, whose conduct at times sinks to the level of lunacy or buffoonery, rather than a poet and musician and lover of the æsthetic, which King

Réné seems really to have been. Henrik Hertz, a Danish Jew and a poet of much eminence, has dealt with the subject in a much more becoming way, in the shape of a dramatic poem of considerable length, entitled "King Réné's Daughter." The King had in fact two daughters—one the much-stricken Margaret of Anjou, whom Shakespeare defamed so terribly, as a queen "with the heart of a tigress," in his play of "Henry VI.;" the other Yoland or Iolanthe—the heroine of the romance so often treated, "Tristan and Iolanthe." With these the aged and chivalrous King spent the later years of his life, after he had lost much of his worldly possessions, in comparative happiness—a gentleman, a poet and a musician to the last. Mr. Theodore Martin, who translated Hertz's work into English, describes King Réné in very different terms from either Scott or Shakespeare. "He was, as Hertz depicts him," he says, "a brave, generous, pious and cutivated gentleman. Some of his literary works still exist, and we have a strong impression that we have heard of songs that are attributed to him being still sung in Provence."

Chivalry was running to seed, however, in the later part of the fifteenth century, when King Réné flourished. Jean Notredame (or Nostradamus), one of the most scholarly of the Troubadours, laments the decay which had fallen upon the fine flower, and explained it ingenuously thus: "Mais defaillans des Mecenas, defaillerent aussi les poetes." The Crusades, however, would seem to have been the main cause of the decline. These woke up the better nature of man. The hands that could wield the battle axe and the great two-handled sword on Moslem crests felt shame at twanging the strings of rebeck or lute or listening to artificial chansons on the wife of some other or stories of imaginary heroism while the field of the real summoned brave hearts to be up and doing for the defense of Christendom.

Many of the political *sirventes* were poetical calls to arms under the banner of the Cross. Although a considerable air of labor and artigciality characterizes most of such efforts, owing to the rules of rhyme and metre then prevalent, some even under straight-jacket conditions, display much strength and beauty. This one of Pons de Capadenil's, for instance, displays both ingenuity in rhyme and deep religious feeling happily blended:

Our guide and our protector now is He
  Who led the Three Kings erst, to Bethlehem wending:
His mercy points the way for all to flee
  Which all who with true hearts are thither tending
  Will find is one that's in salvation ending.
How mad, how mad indeed, must that man be
Who scorns the Cross thus from perversity
  And only after worldly wealth contending,
  His honor losing and his God offending!

See then how great must that one's folly be
  Who does not take up arms! Our Saviour, bending
Toward his disciples, said: "Come, follow Me—
  Out from your hearts all worldly thoughts first sending."
  Unto His word the time's come for attending.
More than who lives has he who o'er the sea
Dies for His name; who lives has less than he
  Who gains a victory over Death, expending
  His life to purchase happiness ne'er ending.

Then 'fore the Cross all humbly bend thy knee!
  Thus from thy sins all punishment forefending:
For on the Cross there died, to set thee free,
  That Saviour who, the penitent thief befriending
  At the last hour, left to his fate impending
The scoffing sinner. By the Cross saved He
The wretches struggling in perdition's sea,
  Thus by His death our souls from death defending.
  Oh, woe to him who scorns this love transcending!

How vain will all ambition's victories be
  If we neglect upon our God depending!
Great Alexander, who from sea to sea
  Had conquered all, what had he at life's ending
  But a poor shroud? Oh, folly past defending
To choose the evil when the good we see—
That which will fade, not what eternally
  Will live! This ever to the world attending
  Blinds us to sin and keeps us from amending.

And let no baron deem that he can be
  Held a true Knight but by assistance lending
To set the Sepulchre of Jesus free.
  Arms, honor, chivalry are blending
  To call him to the field: his hither tending
Is his sole claim to Heaven's felicity,
Which well a prize for Kings and Counts may be:
  Their high deeds there, in that good cause contending,
  Their souls from flames and endless pains forefending.

The aged and the cripple who would be
  Spared from the struggle may their wealth by spending
In the good cause purchase immunity,
  'Stead of themselves their riches o'er sea sending.
  But woe to those who, sure of God offending,
Nor go nor send! What will their feelings be
When at the last day God shall say: "For thee,
  Thou false of heart, I died?" Oh, direful ending!
  The justest then may dread his fate impending.

The foregoing translation (which was anonymous) preserves the metre and the rhyme-ending repetitions of the original very faithfully, according to Professor Diez and other critics. It must be owned that it was somewhat of a *tour de force* to compose a poem of any length hampered by such laws of composition as the old Provençal cult imposed.

That gallant soldier, Richard of the Lion Heart, was a great patron of the Troubadours, if not actually one of the tuneful band himself. His mother, Queen Eleanor, was also a liberal patroness of the order, because, doubtless, they had sung her praises in terms that did not minimize her deserts.

Dante makes mention of a fiery and romantic Troubadour, Bertran de Born, as one whom he wished to personify as "War." His choice appears to have been fully justified, since Bertran was

always looking out for adventures in which the sword and lance were the most reliable agencies. Bertran was a close friend of King Richard, as well as of his brothers, each of whom he used to address with as much familiarity as Falstaff did "Prince Hal." He was a good deal of the Berserker in his warlike temperament. Raynouard, one of the Troubadour chroniclers, describes a call to arms which he addressed to King Richard as a piece "semble avoir été inspirée par l'ivresse du carnage" (the intoxication of slaughter). The description seems apt:

It joys me well, the sweet springtide, when leaves and flowers appear;
It joys me well by greenwood side the blithe bird's song to hear;
But more, perdi! I joy to see the tented field afar,
And steed and knight arrayed for fight, in panoply of war!

It joys me well when outscouts fleet before their foemen run,
For then, full short, the main hosts meet, the tug of war comes on!
I love to see the castle storm'd, when thundering fragments fall,
And in the ditch the palisades smile grim beneath the wall!

* *

Meat, drink, and sleep, I'll not deny, are good things in their way,
But give me, sirs, the war cry that drowns the din of fray,
When knightless steeds through forest glades shriek wildly as they go,
And wounded men cry out for aid within the foss below!

Ye barons that have ought to pledge, in God's name pledge it now,
And mortgage town and tower and land for sword and axe and bow.
Off, off, friend Papiol; bear with haste to "Oc and No" my song,
And bid him speed the good old trade: we have had peace too long!

Papiol was Bertran's *jongleur*, and "Oc and No" was the pet name by which Bertran always referred to the warrior King—"Richard Yea and Nay."

Although some of the lyrics of the Troubadour period are erotic and even gross in character, and many of the tales relate to acts of gross sensuality, it must not be deduced that the influence of Provençalism was generally for evil. On the contrary, we learn from the highest authority that it was the inspiration of the spirit of chivalry and true knighthood. There was nothing of evil attributed when a knight devoted himself to the service of some noble lady, even though she were married. When knight or lady forgot their moral obligations the fact was regarded with horror, and the knight was forever barred, if not done to death by the injured husband, from the society of honorable gentlemen. In a movement extending over so large an area, in several countries—France, Spain and Italy—and covering so great a stretch of time, as the Provençal did, naturally there must have been moral lapses. But on the whole, the bond of chivalry was well maintained. Even though amorous poetry was written, the sentiments which found expression were mostly artificial, and had no deeper meaning than the complimentary phrases which in our own time are heard in social life, on ceremonious occasions. The attachments which existed between ladies and their cavaliers were mostly of the platonic order. Sometimes

they were sublimely so—notably in the case of Dante and his divinity, the fair Beatrice; perhaps also in the case of Petrarch and his Laura—certainly in that of Laura, whatever may have been the wishes and hopes of Petrarch. Spiritual love was never more truly exemplified than in the case of Dante. It finds exquisite expression in his references to Beatrice in the "Divina Commedia." In his "Vita Nuova" he himself tells us how it grew on him from the moment he first beheld her. She was then but nine years old, and he was falling into the vale of years. Italian maidens are often more than children at such an age; she must have been exceptionally advanced in beauty of person and mind. She was the daughter of a wealthy Florentine, Falco Portinari, the founder of the Hospital of Santa Maria Nuova. Dante was instantly charmed by the delightful vision which that day burst on him. "From that time forth, I say," he wrote, "that love held sovereign empire over my soul, which had so readily been betrothed unto him. . . . Oftentimes he enjoined me to strive, if so I might behold this youngest of the angels." It was this ideal love which, he says, raised him "above the common herd" (Hell ii., 105); and it was she, he again declares, "taught him to love virtue" (Purg. xxx., 123), and "from slave to freedom brought him" (Par. xxxi., 75). At the second time he saw her, which was nine years later, she must have been then a beautiful woman. She spoke some gracious words to him. They fired him so that he sat down and penned some sonnets to her. She was soon after married to Simon di Bardi, a wealthy Florentine. Still the poet continued to send her sonnets full of delicate praise. No offense was caused by this, for such was the practice of chivalry in that romantic age. There was something truly elevating in such attachments as these, when loyally observed. The custom had undoubtedly much to do in softening the asperities of a turbulent age and smoothing the way for a higher plane of civilization.

Some writers assert that there was an institution among the Troubadours called the Court of Love, whose function it was to determine knotty points in affairs of the heart; but Professor Diez casts doubt upon the belief. It is certain, however, that one of the prominent poets, Maïtre Ermengan, composed a poem of enormous length—twenty-seven thousand verses—called the "Breviary of Love." But this work is really more a philosophical treatise embodying all the knowledge of the age, than a composition *à la* Ovid.

Some of the very earliest of the Provençal literary works were on religious subjects. An eminent author, M. Raynouard, describes one of these, the "Life of Boethius" (only a fragment of which is known to exist), as "the most ancient monument of the romance language that we now possess."

Several other religious poems, of very great age, are amongst the memorials of the beginnings of Provençal literature. The most important of these is in the form of a dramatic work—and believed by M. Raynouard to be the very earliest attempt at dramatic composition in any modern language—entitled the "Mystery of the Wise and the Foolish Virgins. There are several religious compositions in the shape of Legends of Saints; and there is also a long chronicle in rhyme, byGuillaume de Tudela (A. D. 1210-1220) describing the wars against the Albigenses.

The modern story of "Parsifal" seems to have been an evolution of a mediæval legend of Provence. Wolfram von Eschenbach declared that he had derived his story of "Titural and Perceval" from the Provençal of Master Kyot or Guiot.

Although it is known that many prose and poetical romances adorned the literature of Provence, only a few are now to be found. The principal ones are "Gerard de Rossillon," "Janfre, the Son of Dovon," "Ferebras" and "Philomena." The paucity of these compositions has surprised the students of Provençal letters, since it is claimed for the country where they originated that it was the cradle of romantic poetry. This claim is sustained, on the other hand, by the profusion of lyrical works which are to be found, and whose merit is so unequal. In strong contrast to the fewness of the more ambitious compositions of the Troubadour period is the great number of romances produced by the northern Trouveres. Many of these were of great length, ranging from five to ten thousand verses; and opinion is divided as to whether each of these was read or sung at the one sitting, or given with "intervals for refreshments." The latter hypothesis is evidently the more likely to be correct.

That all the poets and writers of that fascinating age were not exactly in the habit of dropping honey and flowers from their pens at all times is a fact of which indubitable evidence survives. Some of them, like the Irish bards, had tongues or pens like scorpions, and could satirize brother poets and gleemen with raillery as biting as that of Pope or Byron. The gentle arts of "log-rolling" and depreciating were not unknown in the age of chivalry, as the works of both Troubadour and Trouvere attest. Pierre d'Auvergne seems to have been a veritable Jeffreys of the twelfth century. He has left the world an amusing estimate of the various worthies of chivalry and song who flourished contemporaneously with his noble self. In one passage he hits off four:

> I will sing of all those Troubadours who sing in different styles. The worst among them think to speak well, but all should repeat their songs somewhere else, for I hear a good hundred herdsmen meddling therewith, not one of whom knows the difference between high and low.

This objection touches Pierre Rogier, and I will therefore censure him first. He sings right openly of love:: it would better become him to carry the psalter in church, or the sconces with the great wax lights.

The second is Giraut de Borneil; he compares a cloth burned by the sun to his meagre and woful songs, which are only fit for an old water-carrier. If he could but see himself in a glass he would not give a hep for himself.

The third is Bernart de Ventadour, who is even less by an inch than Borneil: but he had for his father a servant who shot well with a wooden bow, and his mother heated ovens and collected firewood.

The fourth is Brive de Limousin: the most famous jongleur between here and Benevento. When the wretch sings, one may fancy one hears a sick pilgrim. I must almost pity him.

If one might safely say that it is only the mediocre in art who are capable of jealousy and the disparagement of others, then it would be safe to assume that the Troubadours who sang and wrote at that particular epoch were of inferior rank in the gentle profession. But the fact that three or four of them are mentioned by Dante as men of eminence, and taken even as typical Troubadours, must give a different idea. According to the highest standard of their time they held a high plane on the Parnassian hill. Envy and jealousy can rankle even in celestial minds, according to one of the greatest of poets.

But the work of the Troubadours must be considered from a much higher point of view. It is not the individual failings of the race that ought to engage the students' attention, but the influence exerted by the ideals which they set before men's minds. If they sang the praises of beauty somewhat extravagantly, they awakened the nobler part of man in no less effective a way than they did the baser, by the irresistible appeal that aroused the world long before "Arms and the Man" rang forth from the great Mantuan's lyre. If they inspired respect for womanhood, not less did they inflame the mind to the defense of the Christian religion. They were a tremendous factor in the formation of the Crusades and the keeping alive of the impulse that first set these in motion. They softened the asperities of a semi-barbarous age, and kindled the light of literature even amid the flames of war. It was a unique spectacle.

Frédéric Mistral is the leading spirit in the revival of this long neglected cult. His enthusiasm for it is a passion. He claims for the Provençal dialect more than many philologists are disposed to concede. He would have it acknowledged as an independent language, the direct offshoot of the Roman, and the parent of all the other romance languages—French, Italian and Spanish. He is the disciple of an earlier enthusiast, Joseph Roumaunville, who at Avignon, fifty years ago, founded the society of the Félibrege, whose purpose was to revive the decaying langue d'Oc, and formulate its grammatical and etymological system. The question is, however, largely academic. It is entirely different from the case of the Gaelic revival in Ireland. Most philologists are agreed that the Gaelic is

a pure tongue, with a perfect and scientific system of grammar and syntax; as old evidently as the ancient Greek, mayhap as old as the Hebrew. But the langue d'Oc at best cannot be considered otherwise than as the rearrangement of the fragments of a beautiful broken vase.

It is a characteristic of languages of such a kind that they readily lend themselves to poetical forms. They are more plastic than the iron-bound Latin, for instance, and as euphonious as the musical rhythmy Greek. Scotch dialect and Provençal are very much alike in this respect. Mistral has acquired a high reputation among modern poets for the uses to which he has applied the ancient speech of Provence. His first great work was a great pastoral called "Mirèio," and it dealt with rustic life, its joys and its sorrows, in his native country by the Mediterranean shore. The richness of its vocabulary and the freshness of the imagery employed at once impressed the public mind in France and raised the author to the front rank of modern poets. It was in 1858 that "Mirèio" first came out, and it has never waned in favor since. The Academy awarded its crown to the "Mirèio" and gave the author a prize of two thousand francs and the medal of honor. Two more prizes fell to his lot in 1884, together with the more substantial prize of ten thousand francs, from the Academy; and the Government conferred on him also the grand cordon of the Legion of Honor. Nine years later the author produced another great work under the title of "Calendan"—an epic of the heroic order. Eight years later he gave the world another fine work—"Lis Isclo d'Oro"—and after another eight years came "Nerto," an epic of the Papal age in Avignon. In 1897 he produced "Le Poeme du Rhone"—a cyclopædic poem, dealing with the country and the people among whom that arrowy river has sped its way since it first sprang down from its source in the mountains. He tells of their lives, their towns, their villages, their customs, their legends and their many picturesque and quaint old communal ways. He sings also with a simple piety. There is none of the modern skeptic about Mistral and his work. He is an old-fashioned man who has been brought up in the love and knowledge of God, and is never ashamed to confess his faith. The many quaint superstitions of the Southern French peasantry find reflection in his works, but he is not ashamed of these traditional things. They may be wrong, but they are of his beloved Provence, racy of the soil and racy of the people; that is enough for him.

Mistral is a delightful study, in this hard, money-grubbing, tense-nerved age. He places before us a panorama of soothing idylls. He gives us to eat of the lotus-leaf, and we have no desire then to return to our hard, grim, repellent daily grind of work and worry.

Perhaps this is why the art of the poets has been called divine. They can minister even to the mind diseased and soothe if not pluck out altogether our rooted sorrows. Therefore was Virgil called the Magician and Scott the Wizard of the North.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

GERALD GRIFFIN.

THE recent occurrence of the natal centenary of Ireland's sweet singer and greatest novelist, Gerald Griffin, called attention anew to the quality of his work as a writer, and to the moral beauty of his character which ranks him with the best types of Catholic laymen that the nineteenth century has produced. A review of his life and work, therefore, would not seem out of place. Not long ago suggestions were heard of a centennial edition of his works. His memory well deserves the honor that such a step would imply. For upon all lovers of pure literature his writings have an unsurpassed claim, whilst for those who can appreciate nobility of character, his life must possess a special charm. And short as that life was, there was nevertheless crowded into it a work destined not soon to perish. Let us glance at both and see whether our examination does not agree with the popular judgment.

In the autumn of the year 1823 there passed over to London from his loved home on the Shannon a young Irishman not yet out of his teens. He went forth, like Burke and Goldsmith and many another son of Erin had gone before him, with a light pocket, but with a light heart and a stock of other wealth—intellect and genius and the irrepressible ambition of youth to win a niche in the temple of fame. Such a capital, however, was potential rather than actual, and before it materialized cost the holder much suffering, bitter disappointment and the surrender of cherished ideals. This youth of fortune was Gerald Griffin. His dearest desire was to win dramatic fame by no less arduous means than the revolutionizing of the dramatic taste of the time. From his early youth he had fostered the ambition of seeing his own work side by side with those of the great playrights. But the grave had closed over him before his most notable production, "Gisippus," was put on the stage.

His biography, written by his brother, and to which all readers of Griffin must feel indebted, says that our subject was born in

the city of Limerick, on the 12th of December, 1803, "of," it is careful to add, "the old Milesian stock." Not long before this event his father, Patrick Griffin, a considerable farmer, had moved into town from a place called Woodfield, in the neighboring county of Clare (where he had lived for a number of years), in order to secure better educational facilities for his children. However satisfactory in this respect the change of residence may have been, it was not so in regard to his business in Limerick—the management of a brewery, for which it appears he was little adapted, the enterprise proving a failure. He was a man of optimistic nature; undemonstratively but deeply religious; patriotic, often referring with pride to the fact that he was one of the Volunteers of 1782; and not without a share of the national gift of humor.

But, as so often happens, Gerald Griffin owed more to mother than to father. His mother was a sister of a distinguished Limerick physician, and a woman of culture and refinement, with a marked fondness for literature, which she indulged with sound taste and judgment. The influence of such a mother on a child of the temperament of Gerald Griffin can be more easily imagined than described. There is not a line that he ever wrote that does not reflect it. Among his papers was found after his death a manuscript copy of "The Deserted Village," in his mother's handwriting, bearing at the foot of the last page her comment, "An invaluable treasure." It is evident that from his childhood she had seen in him a something which picked him out from his fellows and which she sedulously sought to foster.

The family was a numerous one, consisting of nine sons (of whom Gerald was the youngest) and four daughters. It made up a household about which we read with more than ordinary interest and which, in some of its characteristics, recalls that middleman's family (the Dalys) whose enduring acquaintance all readers of Griffin must have made in "The Collegians," for the description there of the home life of the Munster middleman might, in its general lines, apply to the author's own family before its members were scattered by the winds of change and time. They were a singularly united and affectionate family, and life, for them, seemed happier than the average Irish life—too bright, indeed, to last long.

When our subject was a child of seven the family removed to the country—to a delightful spot on the Shannon some twenty-eight miles from Limerick. Here his boyhood was spent, amid scenery which made an ineffaceable impression on his memory, for many a descriptive passage from his pen is reminiscent of its charms. The place was called "Fairy Lawn." A little above it the river spreads into the dimensions of a lake, separating the two shores by

a magnificent flood and presenting a spectacle which evoked from the author of "The Faery Queen" a graceful reference in the line:

The spacious Shenan, spreading like a sea."

Of the scene in question, dear to every member of the Griffin family, and especially so to him who has depicted it with the power of a master, we have an exquisite description in the third chapter of "The Collegians," where we are told amid what surroundings the Munster farmer sat down to breakfast and in what wise he conducted that agreeable function.

After a few years' private tuition Gerald was sent at the age of eleven to a classical school in Limerick, where he evinced such a fondness for Virgil, Ovid and Horace—particularly the first named—that his lessons are said "to have lost all the character of a schoolboy's task." His stay here, however, was brief, for on the opening of a school at Loughill, in the immediate neighborhood of Fairy Lawn, he became a pupil there. In this rural academy, which was conducted by a young man named Donovan from the classical "Kingdom of Kerry," the author of "The Rivals" received that impression of a country school which is so vividly reproduced in that work, although we are assured that the prototype was a young man of respectable educational attainments, who would himself have been as much diverted by the sketch in question as any other reader. Of his skill as a prosodist, however, an odd anecdote is related. "Mr. Donovan," asked a pupil one day, "how ought a person to pronounce the letter 'i' in reading Latin?" "If you intend to become a priest, Dick," answered the teacher, "you may as well call it 'ee,' for I observe the clergy pronounce it in that manner; but if not, you may call it 'ee' or 'i' just as you fancy." Whatever may have been the effect of such a reply on the class generally, there was one pupil who was excessively amused at it, and that was young Gerald Griffin, who, in the course of his studies in Limerick, had never heard of such conditional pronunciation.

His favorite amusements at this period were fishing and shooting, though not for big game, his prowess in both being limited by the primitive character of his appliances. His fondness for fishing led to many delightful rambles, the memory of which is reflected with inimitable charm in his writings. Near the stream wherein he angled, on a small patch of green in a secluded glen, "and close by a huge cliff, stood the parish chapel, a small cruciform thatched building, in which Mr. Donovan on week-days was permitted to hold his school."

To this well-remembered spot Griffin paid a tender tribute in a verse preface to one of his earliest books ("Tales of the Munster Festivals"), localizing it with touching vividness in the lines:

> The clift-bound Inch, the chapel in the glen,
> Where oft with bare and reverent locks we stood,
> To hear th' Eternal truths; the small dark maze
> Of the wild stream that clipp'd the blossom'd plain,
> And toiling through the varied solitude,
> Uprais'd its hundred silver tongues and babbled praise.

Although our subject's early environment may not have been favorable to the acquisition of purely academic knowledge, it was nevertheless congenial to that love for literature which early made its appearance in him and grew with his growth. "It evinced itself at this time," says his biographer, "by his generally sitting to his breakfast or tea with a book before him, which he was reading, two or three under his arm and a few more on the chair behind him. This was often a source of amusement to the rest of the family. He had a secret drawer in which he kept his papers, and it was whispered that he wrote scraps and put them there; but he was such a little fellow then that it was thought to be in imitation of one of his elder brothers, who had a strong taste for poetry. . . . He had made a blank book, and many of his hours of recreation were occupied in copying pieces of poetry into it."

In the year 1817 his eldest brother, who held a commission in the army, returned after an absence of some years spent in Canada with his regiment. Being much impressed with the new country as a field for settlers and appreciating the difficulties with which the family at home had to struggle, he urged them to emigrate. The suggestion, which did not at first meet with favor, was some three years later adopted in part, the parents and majority of the children crossing the Atlantic and finding, further south than was originally intended, a home in a beautiful district of country in the State of Pennsylvania. Gerald was not among the exiles, but he felt the separation none the less keenly.

About this time one of his brothers took up the practice of his profession—that of medicine—at Adare, a village some ten miles distant from Limerick, and thither the rest of the diminished household at Fairy Lawn removed with him. This was William Griffin, "whose affectionate care," to quote the words of the dedication to him of his famous brother's biography, "fostered that talent in his younger brother from which the public has derived such solid pleasure."

Gerald had now reached an age (17) when the question of a profession pressed itself into notice. Two of his brothers having already chosen medicine, it was felt that he would follow their example. For a time he studied with that end in view. Of his brief experience in this connection a curious anecdote is related. In the absence of Dr. Griffin, he was once asked to attend a man who had rather seriously hurt his knee. Among those whom

curiosity or sympathy had drawn to the house of the patient was one of those empirics known as "bone setters," who by that air of superior wisdom which they could so readily assume, coupled with a style of speech more pompous than lucid, gained such an influence among the peasantry a generation or two ago. Gerald's examination of the injured limb was jealously and closely watched by this worthy, who on its completion turned to the diffident young student, and in a manner intended to awe him as well as those present, asked: "Pray, sir, do you think the patella is fractured?" "I was puzzled," said Gerald afterwards when telling the story, "to think what answer I should give him, for I did not so much as know what the patella was. I kept looking at the limb, all the while engaged in trying to keep my countenance. At length I said as gravely as I could, and with perfect truth, 'I do not know that it is,' with which he seemed satisfied, so I recommended some soothing applications and got out of the house as quickly as I could to avoid any more of his learned questions."

In the Adare home the quiet current of family life, checkered only by the shadow of emigration, gradually resumed its even tenor. There, as at Fairy Lawn, the development of Griffin's literary powers was helped by his environment, which in his works we find reflected in fond memory, as in the well-known quatrain:

> Oh, sweet Adare! Oh, lovely vale!
> Oh, pleasant haunt of sylvan splendor,
> Nor summer sun, nor morning gale,
> E'er hailed a scene more softly tender.

The place to which this graceful apostrophe was addressed is picturesquely situated on the banks of a small stream called the Mague. In the immediate vicinity is the seat of the Earl of Dunraven, the central object of one of the noblest manorial parks in the country. Here pastoral and sylvan scenery spread before the eye of the future poet and novelist a wealth of natural charm difficult anywhere to match, whilst monastic and feudal ruins spoke to him of a past which his imagination was some day to illumine and make real to his readers. "Gerald," says his biographer, "took the greatest delight in wandering with his sisters through these sweet scenes, stealing sometimes at dusk of evening through the dim cloisters of the abbey and calling to mind the time when religion held her undisturbed abode there; when the bell tolled for morning prayer or the vesper hymn, or the sounds of war or revelry were heard in startling contrast from the adjacent castle. All these ruins, particularly the religious ones, affected him with a warm and reverent enthusiasm."

To such influences may be ascribed the birth of that project—a series of novels illustrative of certain epochs of Irish history, of

which, however, but one example from his pen has been given us. This was "The Invasion," the forerunner, if not the impulse of more than one historical novel by other hands.

Adare possessed the further advantage of easy access to Limerick, where a youth of studious habits and literary aspirations could consult suitable works and meet persons of congenial tastes. Thus our subject met John Banim, at this time an occasional visitor to the "City of the Violated Treaty." They became acquainted through a dramatic society of which the young Adare student was one of the founders, and on the performances of which Banim had written some critiques in the local press.

It was about this period that Griffin made his first appearance in print, the occasion being a series of articles contributed to a local paper which led to a short-lived engagement. He appears to have been an extensive reader, with a marked partiality for imaginative literature, and to have acquired a taste which, directed in youth along the proper channels, found in the course of his reading satisfaction only in the pure and noble. Having now given up definitely all notion of the medical profession, he devoted himself principally to a systematic study of dramatic poetry, which appears to have been his first literary preference. That he was also absorbed in some task of authorship is certain, yet Dr. Griffin was surprised one morning when Gerald placed in his hands the result of this special work, which was a tragedy under the title of "Aguire," with a request that he read it, and the intimation that he had formed the purpose of trying his fortune in London. As the production of one who had scarcely emerged from boyhood, the play, which was suggested by a Spanish story, profoundly impressed his brother, as it did later no less a judge of dramatic excellence than John Banim himself. It was soon followed by two others, as to which, however, nothing has definitely been recorded. But the proposal to leave home was another matter. Considering Gerald's youth, inexperience and temperament, also the Quixotic nature of his intention of entering upon his literary career in London as a playright with a view, as he himself puts it, "to revolutionizing the dramatic taste of the time," life for him in a vast and strange city, without a friend to look to for counsel or aid, seemed to his brother to be fraught with danger. It was natural, therefore, that Dr. Griffin, who since the emigration of the heads of the family had filled their place towards his youngest brother with unfailing care and devotion, should, as he did, hesitate for some time about giving his consent to such a step. On the other hand, he realized that in the writings submitted to him there was a power that must one day compel recognition, and eventually this view of the case prevailed.

Just then the family moved to Pallas Kenry, some six miles away, Dr. Griffin being induced thereto by the prospect of an improved practice, and Gerald postponed his departure for London until they had settled in their new home. From here in the autumn of 1823, before he had completed his twentieth year, he went forth to see what fortune held for him in life's lottery.

He was not long in the big strange city of London before the day dreams formed on the banks of the Shannon faded at touch of the stern realities of experience. The story of his early struggles in the British metropolis makes interesting, though painful, reading. Of them in a letter to his parents, dated October 12, 1825, two years after he had left home, he says, among other things: "I have not had since I left Ireland a single moment's peace of mind—constantly running backward and forward and trying a thousand expedients, and only to meet disappointments everywhere I turned. . . . When first I came to London my own self-conceit, backed by the opinion of one of the most original geniuses of the age, induced me to set about revolutionizing the dramatic taste of the time by writing for the stage. Indeed the design was formed and the first step taken (a couple of pieces written) in Ireland. I cannot with my present experience conceive anything more comical than my own views and measures at the time. A young gentleman totally unknown even to a single family in London, coming into town with a few pounds in one pocket and a brace of tragedies in the other, supposing that the one will set him up before the others are exhausted, is not a very novel, but a very laughable delusion."

Describing his repeated failures to get any of his plays accepted, he admits ruefully that he was forced by sheer necessity to give up dramatic writing altogether and seek in other directions, not fame, but even a bare livelihood. "It was then," he proceeds, "I set about writing for the weekly publications, all of which, except the *Literary Gazette*, cheated me abominably. Then . . . I wrote for the great magazines. My articles were generally inserted, but on calling for payment, seeing that I was a poor, inexperienced devil, there was so much shuffling and shabby work that it disgusted me and I gave up the idea of making money that way. I now lost heart for everything; got into the cheapest lodgings I could make out, and there worked on, rather to divert my mind from the horrible gloom that I felt growing on me in spite of myself than with any hope of being remunerated."

Although his quest for employment was kept up, he could find practically nothing to do. How desperate and urgent was his condition may be gathered from the almost incredible fact that for two guineas he translated a volume and a half of Prevot's works.

"My dear Dan," he says in a letter to his biographer, commenting upon the feat, "tell this not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askalon."

Singularly enough, as his needs grew in urgency, his sensitiveness with respect to them and his self-dependence increased to an almost morbid degree, hedging him round with a barrier of reserve that neither kindness nor sympathy could pierce. This was his condition when John Banim sought to succor him, but found himself repulsed. Banim, it appears, had twice gone to see him at his lodgings, which were now "a small room in some obscure court near St. Paul's," and not finding him in on either occasion had questioned the landlady as to his circumstances, only to learn that her lodger more than once had left himself without the necessaries of life. "He appeared to be despondent," she added, "dressed but indifferently, shut himself up for whole days together in his room without sending her for any provision, and when he went out it was only at nightfall, when he was likely to meet no one that he knew."

Shocked at what he had heard, Banim left a note for his distressed friend, delicately but cordially offering help, which, as has already been said, was refused—an action on Griffin's part which can be explained only by his extremely sensitive nature, touched to the quick by the casual disclosure (even to such a friend as Banim) of his straits. It led to an estrangement between them, one, however, not of long standing and which required but a word of explanation to remove.

It must surely have been one of life's ironies that in this, the darkest hour of his fortunes, Griffin's genius should have flowered in "Gisippus," written about this time, but destined not to receive the honor of public presentation during his lifetime, it not having been put on the boards until 1842, two years after the grave had closed over its author. It may be said in passing that this play was one of those specially selected by Macready in that eminent actor's attempt to restore the classical drama, and that on its first presentation he filled the leading rôle. But so far as winning bread for Griffin or helping him to a competence was concerned this dramatic achievement availed him naught.

When failure had all but crushed him chance, or rather Providence, interposed. A friend whom he had not seen for an unusually long interval dropped in to see him. Amazed as well as pained at what he saw, more especially as Griffin himself did not appear to realize the gravity of his own condition, this friend frightened the half-starved author by blurting out that he looked like a ghost—a salutary burst of candor for Griffin, as it opened his eyes to his

plight. His visitor, without informing him of his intention, went straightway to Dr. Maginn, whom he acquainted with what he had just witnessed. Now under a rather gruff exterior the famous Corkonian hid a kindly heart, which was deeply touched at this tale of distress—one, too, concerning a fellow-countryman—and with him to feel was to act. The result for Griffin was an engagement on the *Literary Gazette*, which proved to be the turning point in his career. It not only relieved him from his immediate embarrassments, but it also enabled him to win a self-supporting position, for although the remuneration was not in itself a competence, it nevertheless gave him a sense of security. Moreover, the work involved, which took up only a portion of each day, left him considerable leisure for other literary undertakings. The tide had at last turned. Before long he could get all the work he wanted, and, what was more to the purpose at this particular juncture, prompt payment therefor. He could also look beyond the rut of his daily labor at possibilities of greater things, for thus far he could not help feeling that he was but a literary hack. Let us glance for a moment at the prospect before him.

The time was the close of the first quarter of the last century. Catholic emancipation had not yet come. Ireland herself still lay in the shadow of the penal period. As to imaginative literature, at any rate, her position in English letters was not conspicuous. Swift, Burke, Goldsmith, Moore—to mention the names that loom largest in the survey—had, it is true, won a commanding place from which time has not dislodged them. But none of these had left a picture of Irish life which might be pointed to as a standard presentment of a type or of a characteristic "racy of the soil." Of the four Goldsmith may be said to have been the only novelist; but what we have from him as such, precious though it be, reveals in regard to Ireland an entire absence of national color. Maria Edgeworth, then, was the most notable pioneer in the field that Griffin entered as she was about to quit it. But even she has not the hold on the reader that Griffin has. John Banim, it is true, in collaboration with his brother, was coming into notice as a writer of fiction in a way which soon eclipsed his fame as a dramatist. Yet here again the best does not rise to Griffin's level. The same may be said of Carleton, with, however, this qualification, that he had "sold his birthright for a mess of pottage," having accepted a position wherein caricature, rather than delineation of his own folk opened for him a lucrative if not honorable career. Yet it is but fair to add that he lived to make amends, bridging thus the chasm between "The Stations" and that noblest emanation of his genius, "The Poor Scholar."

Then there were writers who had stooped to a marketable conception and treatment of Irish character, finding in the novel and periodical of the day profitable and congenial employment for their pens. It was a time when a writer of Griffin's power might have rapidly made a fortune.

This, as respects the national novel, was our subject's literary heritage. But, to his everlasting credit be it said, when it came to a question between lucre and principle, he remained loyal to his conscience and to his art.

Though his work as a magazine writer and reviewer kept him busy, he nevertheless realized that he was but groping in the dark for his proper place. Light came to him presently in an offer from his good friend Banim, who asked him to contribute a story to a further series of the "Tales by the O'Hara Family." Although this invitation (prompted obviously by the most considerate kindness and implying faith in Griffin's ability) was declined, it yet confirmed his own belief that in the field to which it pointed lay the fairest promise for his labors. Thither, therefore, he began to feel his way. The first intimation we get of his progress is in a letter to his future biographer, in which he says that he was working up his recollections for a volume which, under the title of "Munster Anecdotes," was to consist of short stories illustrative of the manners and scenery of the south of Ireland. "Could you," he asks his brother, "send me some materials for a few short tales, laying the scene about the sea coast—Kilkee?"

When in the autumn of the year 1826 Dr. Griffin paid him a visit, he " found him occupying neatly furnished apartments in Northumberland street, Regent's Park." Not having seen Gerald since the latter had left Ireland, three years before, and knowing but little of the ordeal through which he had passed, he was startled at the physical change in his appearance. "All color," Dr. Griffin writes, "had left his cheek; he had grown very thin, and there was a sedate expression of countenance unusual in one so young and which in after years became habitual to him. It was far from being so, however, at the time I speak of, and readily gave place to that light and lively glance of his dark eye, that cheerfulness of manner and observant humor which from his very infancy had enlivened our fireside circle at home. Although so pale and thin as I have described him, his tall figure, expressive features and his profusion of dark hair, thrown back from a fine forehead, gave an impression of a person remarkably handsome and interesting." This, in personal appeareance, was Gerald Griffin at the age of twenty-two.

His brother found him immersed in his literary engagements.

Besides his work for the magazines and on his contemplated book, he had in a short time written two or three operas, as well as part of a new comedy, which we are told was a charming production "in easy blank verse," bearing a marked resemblance to the old comedies. It was, however, never completed, for on Dr. Griffin's casually observing, as he read a certain passage of it: "Why, Gerald, this scene is in 'The Black Dwarf,'" the sensitive author, who, by the way, had never read that story of Scott's, obtained a copy from a neighboring library only to find the coincidence in question (for such, of course, it was), whereupon he flung his composition aside and could never be prevailed upon to finish it. Another instance of his unconquerable aversion to anything that savored of plagiarism, which he appears to have held in as deep contempt as he had held patronage in the days of his sharpest struggle, occurred during his brother's visit. This was when he was giving the last touches to a word picture of Shrovetide for a series of stories on which he happened to be engaged, and a copy of "Peter of the Castle," then just published, was placed in his hands. Eager to see his friend Banim's new book, he dropped his pen and, glancing at the first chapter of the volume, discovered to his chagrin and amazement a description of the very festival of which at the very moment he himself was busy with a sketch. "He at once," says Dr. Griffin, "tore out the latter from his tale."

"Holland-tide" was, at length, submitted to the publishers and immediately accepted. Whilst the sum paid for the copyright (£70) was not large, the transaction meant much for a young and as yet comparatively unknown writer and afforded Griffin the opportunity of a visit to Ireland and taking a needed rest.

During this visit, which extended from February to August of the year 1827, he wrote the first series of "Tales of the Munster Festivals," in three volumes, including "Card Drawing," "The Half Sir" and "Suil Dhuv." This work, to which the idea of supplying a description of certain festivals observed by the Munster peasantry had given birth, stamped the author as one of the greatest delineators of national manners and customs that Ireland had yet produced. Its keynote is aptly struck in the stanzas "Old Times, Old Times," serving as a preface to one of the stories. Although pointing out some blemishes, attributable to haste and excessive eagerness, the reviewers pronounced favorably on the work, which won immediate, wide and lasting favor.

But Griffin was exceedingly sensitive to anything in the nature of criticism, and this touch of it made him so self-exacting in regard to his next book that a whole year had passed in unsatisfactory and discarded attempts on a variety of subjects before any real

progress had been made with it. Once fairly started, however, the composition proceeded at a marvelously rapid rate. This, which appeared in 1828, was "The Collegians," his masterpiece. Having prematurely arranged for its publication, the printers overtook him long before its completion, with the result that for the rest of the work it was a race between them. When it is remembered that that part of this great novel in which occur its most dramatic scenes and the climax of its interest was written at fever heat, to the cry each morning from the printer of "more copy," there must be conceded to its author an imagination overflowing with his subject and a gift of expression to match it. "'The Collegians,'" as Griffin himself once said, "was a story that wrote itself." In some of the passages the early dramatic passion used to flash out. "What a great deal I would give," said he to his biographer, who was with him at the time the passage in question was written, "to see Edmund Kean in that scene of Hardress Cregan at the party, just before his arrest, where he is endeavoring to do politeness to the ladies while the horrid warning voice is in his ear. The very movements of Kean's countenance in such a scene as that would make one's nerves creep."

Griffin's fame rests principally on "The Collegians," in which we have the finest work ever achieved by an Irish novelist. In description, in plot, in treatment of character, in moral quality and depth and in that consummate union of pathos and humor which marks the master, there are of its kind few, if any, novels to surpass it. The impression produced on its appearance three quarters of a century ago has only deepened with time. The *Dublin University Magazine*, among the first to greet it, closed an appreciation, which has never been questioned, with these words: "'The Collegians' is equal in interest and superior in its fidelity to nature to any Irish novel with which we are acquainted."

At the age of twenty-five Gerald Griffin had become famous. Yet at this moment of splendid achievement, instead of proceeding to add to it, he hesitates, offering no reason except his desire to study for some profession that would make him independent of a fickle reading public. With this object in view, he entered as a law student at the London University; but, like medicine at an earlier age, legal science does not appear to have had any lasting attraction for him. We next find him absorbed in a study of Irish history and antiquities and writing Dr. Griffin about it in terms of characteristic ardor. "I am full of my next tale," he says, "quite enthusiastic—in love with my subject and up to my ears in antiquities at the London institution. A novel full of curious and characteristic traits of ancient Irish life is my object." The outcome

of this study was "The Invasion," of which Thomas Davis has said: "There are in it most exquisite beauty of scene and form, the purest loveliness, the most original heroism of any work we own, and it contains besides invaluable and countless hints on the appearance of ancient Ireland."

His aim being to give as complete and trustworthy a picture of the remote period involved (the eighth century), he made the most exhaustive researches in London and Dublin, which explains the delay in the progress of the work, which was not published until 1832. Meanwhile he had written a further series of the "Munster Festivals," also "The Rivals," "The Christian Physiologist; or, Tales of the Five Senses," "The Duke of Monmouth" and "Tales of My Neighborhood." Though unequal to "The Collegians" in popularity, they yet showed no wane in literary power.

Most of those volumes were written in Ireland, where he made his brother's home, at Pallas Kenry, the centre of his movements. Killarney and the west coast of Clare during this time were frequently visited, and with the latter are associated two fine examples of his verse—"O! Brazil, the Isle of the Blest," and the "Ode to a Sea Gull Seen Off the Cliffs of Moher." Wherever he went in his native land he would have been made much of had he not eschewed social attentions. His self-exclusion, however, did not prevent his fellow-townsmen in 1832 from selecting him as their envoy to Thomas Moore, whom they were anxious to have stand for Limerick in a Parliamentary contest then pending. Although the mission was a failure, the poet declaring that his engagements precluded an acceptance of the honor, it yet gave Griffin an opportunity which he had long desired of meeting Moore, who received him on the occasion with the utmost cordiality and showed by his manner that the fame of his visitor had preceded him at Sloperton.

As to Griffin's power and work as a poet a word may not be out of place. That he had not only "the vision and faculty divine" no one who has read "A Place in Thy Memory" or "Gille Machree," to cite but two of his songs, can deny. Than the former we have authority for saying that there is no lovelier lyric in the English language, whilst of the latter Thomas Davis has declared that it ranks among the finest examples of the ballad in any tongue. Gavan Duffy has referred to this little gem as "striking on the heart like the cry of a woman." "Poetry," writes Edward Hayes in his introductory essay on "The Ballad Poetry of Ireland," "was his (Griffin's) first and greatest inspiration, and if his natural bent had been properly encouraged he would probably have been the greatest of Irish poets."

His blank verse, as in "Gisippus," has been pronounced graceful,

easy and natural, rhythm, diction and thought meeting throughout the fundamental demands of poetry.

As to the narrative ballad we have one superb specimen of his skill in "Orange and Green," that subtle, irresistible appeal of his for tolerance, made in the guise of a simple, heart-reaching story. Had he never written another line than that little ballad he would have earned the everlasting gratitude of all Irishmen.

What Griffin might have done in the field of poetry had he continued therein we can only conjecture. We know that he himself had held lofty ideals in that direction and had made some progress towards their realization; but they fell to the ground when that altered view in regard to his career as a man of letters became a compelling conviction.

At the very zenith of his fame we begin to discern signs of this change—in doubts expressed to friends as to the moral tendency of certain of his earlier novels; in his later writings, which become more and more didactic in tone and "show," as his biographer points out, "the almost complete absence of any dark traits of passion;" in the utterance of such sentiments as those of that beautiful poem, "The Sister of Charity," and in his growing desire to consecrate himself wholly to the service of religion. Passages in a letter to his father, written as early as 1833, go to the heart of the matter. "There is one subject," he then writes, "which I wish no longer to defer speaking about. I mean the desire which I have for a long time entertained of taking orders in the Church. God only knows whether I may ever live to carry the wish into execution. . . . My time," he continues, "is divided between my college course of study and my usual pursuits. . . . To say nothing of the arguments of faith, I do not know any station in life in which a man can do so much good, both to others and himself, as in that of a Catholic priest. . . . To say," he moralizes, "that Gerald, the novel writer, is by the grace of God really satisfied to lay aside forever all hope of that fame for which he was once sacrificing health, repose and pleasure, and to offer himself as a laborer in the vineyard of Jesus Christ; that literary reputation has become a worthless trifle to him, to whom it once was almost all, and that he feels a happiness in the thought of giving all to God—is such a merciful favor that all the fame and riches in the world dwindle into nothing at the thought of it." Comment on sentiments such as these, worthy of a St. Ignatius Loyola or a St. Francis de Sales, is superfluous.

His last visit to London, which was to make arrangements for the publication of his works, was in 1835. Three years later he went with his brother, Dr. Daniel Griffin, on a trip to Scotland,

which he seems thoroughly to have enjoyed and of which he has left some interesting impressions. Although he afterwards resumed at Pallas Kenry the quiet, methodic mode of life, which had now become habitual with him and there was no apparent change in his views respecting a religious vocation, he had nevertheless altered his attention of becoming a priest, for in the month of August, 1838, he announced his final purpose—that of becoming a member of the Society of Christian Brothers, which a generation earlier had been introduced into Ireland by Edmund Ignatius Rice, of Waterford, with results that made the recent celebration of the centenary of that event an expression of national gratitude and rejoicing. There was something in the society that appealed to Gerald Griffin with peculiar force. Its retirement from the world, as complete as that of any of the monastic orders, and, above al, its unselfish and noble object—the Christian education of youth—fell in with his own thoughts and ideals. On the 8th of September of the same year he entered the novitiate of the order in Dublin.

An incident, which shows how utterly he had separated himself from the world, occurred a few evenings before his departure. This was the destruction of his unpublished manuscripts, of which there was a considerable mass, lest there should be anything in them that might wound the moral susceptibilities of any reader. Extraordinary as may seem this proceeding in regard to works which, we are assured, were of real literary value and which as to their moral tone might, it is safe to assume, be classified with Griffin's published writings, of which Cardinal Gibbons has said that nowhere in them "can we find any word or insinuation that could bring a blush to the most delicate cheek or a twinge to the tenderest conscience," still when we consider of what kind their author was in a question of principle, the action is not inconsistent with his character.

Those who may think that Gerald Griffin left the world for the cloister because of disappointment in his literary career have simply failed either to understand the grandeur of the motives that actuated him or to appreciate the peace of mind and happiness he won from that step. Referring to his experience in a letter to a London friend, written in his second year as a religious from the North Monastery, Cork, whither he had been transferred from Dublin, he says: "I was ordered off here from Dublin last June, and have been since enlightening the craniums of the wondering Paddies in this quarter, who learn from me with profound amazement and profit that o-x spells ox; that the top of a map is the north and the bottom the south, with various other 'branches;' as also that they ought to be good boys and do as they are bid and say their prayers every

morning and evening, etc., and yet it seems curious even to myself that I feel a great deal happier in the practice of this routine than I did while I was roving about your great city absorbed in the modest project of rivaling Shakespeare and throwing Scott into the shade."

His obedience to rule, his humility and gentleness, the charm of his conversation caused him not only to be respected but beloved by both his superior and religious confrères. At first, and indeed for a considerable time, he could not be brought to think of resuming his literary labors; and the head of the community wisely refrained from even suggesting it, however ardently he hoped that such talents should not lie fallow.

"During the whole time he was with us," relates one of the Brothers, "I never heard him even once speak of his writings except in private conversation with myself, and then only when I introduced the subject. He was desirous of living unknown; of placing himself on a level in every respect with those immediately around him. . . . On one occasion we were speaking in community of the County of Wicklow and its scenery, when some one present said: 'You have been in the County of Wicklow?' He simply replied that he had. Judge my astonishment when a few days after I met for the first time his 'Reflections on Visiting the Seven Churches.' On another occasion some allusion was made to Ullah (alluding, I believe, to his 'Voluptuary Cured'). He blushed like a child. He was sensibly affected by the least word said in his praise, and avoided everything that could directly or indirectly excite it. . . . He once told me," adds this Brother of his in religion, "that from the moment he got a decidedly serious turn he never could bring himself to the temperament necessary for works of fiction."

His superior's tact, however, in leaving to time the passing away of this indifference to literary occupation was rewarded, for with the gradual diminution of this feeling there came back in a chastened, though unimpaired, form the old passion for writing. A series of tales of a religious character was undertaken, which within its range does not suffer by comparison with his best work. Thus side by side with a piety which was as profound as it was unaffected, and with a scrupulous yet cheerful conformity to monastic routine, there sprang forth that second growth of literary power which, had life been vouchsafed him, might have rivaled the first.

What a spectacle! What an example! Search the history of literature as you may, and you will find it hard, if not impossible, to match it. Think of what it means: A writer of fame, still in his intellectual prime and with the most alluring prospects before

him, relinquishing all for the humble and obscure life of a Christian Brother, and then consecrating his brilliant gifts to the service of religion with an energy and a devotion worthy of his most strenuous day.

His life as a religious was destined to be short. His health, which had never quite thrown off the effects of that terrible ordeal in London, began in the spring of 1840 to show symptoms of an old trouble, an affection of the heart, which any attack of other illness almost invariably induced. On Sunday, the last day of May, he contracted a cold which brought on a fatal illness, death, which he met with the fortitude and resignation of a saint, calling him in the early morning of Friday, 12th of June, at the early age of thirty-six.

But a few days before he had been throwing all his energy into the composition of "Holy Island," the last story to engage his pen. He had just commenced a sentence opening with the words: "Of the things of this world, my son, they are well informed, but as for that abyss beyond—" when the dinner bell of the monastery rang; and with the trained obedience of the religious he laid down his pen. It was for the last time.

"In personal appearance," says his biographer, "he was tall and well formed, and though rather slender possessed considerable strength. . . . He was a person of rather quick temper, much more so, indeed, than one would readily be brought to believe from ordinary intercourse with him. His usual demeanor, however, was that of mildness and gentleness; and even on these occasions when the influence of his natural temperament seemed about to appear he showed a degree of self-possession which prevented it from giving him any serious disturbance."

The conclusion forced upon one who has read Gerald Griffin's works and given any attention to the story of his life is that in him literature has been honored and the annals of his native country enriched. Than he no literary worker has ever been moved by nobler impulses or striven after purer ideals. His place in the world of letters, had he remained in it, would doubtless have been more considerable than it is, but it could not have left a more honorable memory. The land of his nativity must ever hold him in proud and fond remembrance. He has portrayed her people, illuminated her history, depicted her scenery with a pen that has never been surpassed and crowned all by the example of his life. With a more extended literary career, indeed, he might as a national novelist have rivaled Scott in the volume as he did in the quality of his work. But it is questionable whether his country or fellow-countrymen would have been more closely and tenderly

drawn to him than they are. Told by years, his life was short; but by deeds and experience, long. Exposed at the most susceptible period of life to the dangers of a great and strange city, without friend or guide and sometimes penniless, he stood a test to which so many have proved unequal. When he went forth on his quest for fame he bore with him a pure and undimmed faith. When he returned, wearied with the struggle and disappointed with the hard-won prize, he brought back that faith untarnished, sealing his devotion to it by consecrating to its service the years of his intellectual prime.

Taken all in all, then, he has left in his work a precious inheritance and in his life an inspiring example. On her bead-roll of fame Ireland counts many names, distinguished in various departments of human thought and endeavor, which she cherishes and venerates, but to none of her great ones can her heart go out with a fuller measure of love and admiration than to the "gentle, gifted" Gerald Griffin.

E. P. Stanton.

Ottawa, Canada.

A MEDIÆVAL MEDLEY.

THOSE who are conversant with the poetry of the Middle Ages do not find it hard to understand that England, now a stronghold of Protestantism, was once called the Dowry of Mary because of her devotion to our Blessed Lady, for all the best, all the most beautiful, all the most passionate poetry from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries was either addressed to her or to Our Divine Lord, and dealt mostly with His Passion and the grief it caused to His Mother. All the best love songs were addressed to Jesus or Mary, for if our ancestors were ignorant of many things we know, they knew what we too often forget, that the supreme love of all loves is the love of Jesus, the most real romance, the story of a vocation.

It is not, however, with this branch of mediæval poetry that we intend to deal here, but with a less intimate and less devotional kind, from which, incidentally, many curious facts as to the manners and customs of our ancestors may be gathered and many quaint legends and forgotten traditions brought to memory.

The original source from which the learned editor for the Early English Text Society drew the materials of the poems examined here is a thick quarto volume in the Lambeth Palace Library, containing among other treasures the MS. copy of a song called "Ye Develis

Parlament," or the "Parlamentum of Feendes." This poem was first printed in London by Wynkyn de Worde in 1509, and in 1877 was published by the Early English Text Society.

The colophon to Wynkyn de Worde's edition runs as follows: "Thus endeth the parlyament of devylls. Emprynted by Wynkyn de Worde, prynter unto the most excellent princess my lady the kynges moder. The year of our Lord M. CCCCC. & IX."

Henry VIII. of impious memory came to the throne in 1509, but it was not to his mother, Elizabeth of Yorke, who was not a literary woman, but to his grandmother, Margaret Beaufort, daughter of the Duke of Somerset and heiress of John of Gaunt, that Wynkyn de Worde was printer. This "most excellent princess" founded the divinity professorships called after her at Oxford and Cambridge, and finished Christ Church College, begun by Henry VI., at the suggestion of her confessor, John Fisher. She was a patroness first of Caxton and afterwards of Wynkyn de Worde; she translated part of the "Imitation of Christ" from Latin to English, and other books of devotion from the French. She was a most devout woman, and though she did not enter religion, she lived under vows in the world, leading a very strict and pious life. She died in the same year as her husband, Henry VII., in 1509.

"The Parliament of Devils," printed that same year by de Worde, consists of forty-three stanzas, each stanza containing eight octosyllabic or very often longer lines, rhyming alternately. The genius of the anonymous author showed itself more in his rhymes, which are very true, than in his metre, for he was by no means particular as to the number of feet in a line.

We have no clue at all to the identity of the author, who like so many more of these mediæval poets, must forever remain unknown to us; but whoever he was, he had considerable dramatic power, as will appear in the quotations we shall give, and also a gift for character drawing, even of devils.

The poem opens by describing how, when Our Lord was born, all the devils of the earth, of the air and of hell held a parliament to consider who was His Father, and the impudence with which they discuss the question is finely depicted. Some of them declared they did not know who His Father was, but they had heard through the prophets that God had made a covenant with man, and that His Son should become man and suffer death. Then in the following lines, slightly altered and the spelling modernized, as we have done in all the quotations to make them clearer, the devils complain:

> These prophets spoke so in mist;
> What they meant we never knew.
> They spoke of One should be called Christ,
> But Mary's Son is called Jesu.

The prophets also said Christ should be One with God, but "Jesus never in the Godhead grew," so the devils declare that with all their wisdom they are puzzled, and "the cloth is all of another hue." They agreed that if God's Son became man they would claim Him as their own, and then the master devil undertakes the task of tempting and winning Him, as soon as He is ripe.

To me, master devil, it lies;
  To Jesus will I take heed,
To nourish Him in many delights (delices),
  His frail flesh to clothe and feed;
And though that He be never so wise,
  Yet out of the way I will Him lead,
And make of Him both fool and zull (nyce)
  And in hell His soul breed.

For thirty years the fiends in vain lay snares for Him. At last, when He goes into the wilderness, the master devil passes there with Him and relates his experiences in the next stanzas. He wonders at Our Lord's constitution, that He could live for forty days on prayer alone and abstain entirely from food; but when he tempted Him to turn the stones into bread He refused.

Upon a high pinnacle then I Him brought,
And left Him there, and I leapt down
And said, "Save Thee harmless limb and head,
And show Thyself Master while Thou'st young.
If Thou be God's Son, let us see.
  Of Thee is written long agone
Angels in their hands shall bear Thee,
  Lest Thou spurn Thy foot against a stone."
Quoth Jesu, "In holy writ thou mayst see,
  'Tempt not thy Lord God living alone;
With all thy might and thy power (pooste)
  Thou shalt Him serve and other none.'"

Seeing he could not prevail, the devil then takes our Lord to the top of the mountain.

And here he showed Him upon that plain
  Jewels, riches and worldly bliss.
"Worship me here and become my swain,
  And I shall give Thee all this."
"Go, Sathanas! from bliss thou flit;
  From heaven rich, that royal tower!
It is written only in holy writ,
  'Thy Lord God thou shalt honour.'"
"Alas!" quoth the devil, "where hast Thou that wit?"
  Thy words are bitter, Thy works are sour,
Thy conclusion so sore me hit;
  I bowed ne'er to so sharp a shower."

Then the devils hold another parliament in the mist, and complain that some one is coming to rifle their home and gather the flour out of their garners. New "beguilers" threaten them. At first He was called John the Baptist, then Jesus, and now Christ is His name. Then they say they never saw Him sin, and that when He was born wonders happened. In Rome a well of oil sprang up and ran from Trastevere to Tiber; temples fell down and idols broke. The Emperor of Rome saw three suns in one shining clear,

and in their midst a maiden bearing a man child in her arms; and He and the Sibyl both prophesied that the time drew near when God's Son should redeem mankind.

Also three kings came from far,
To worship Jesu all they sought;
That raised Herod's heart there
Them to slay, for they so wrought.

Then the devil counselled Herod to slay the men children that Jesus might die with them; but He escaped into Egypt, seeing Satan's guile. The devil goes on complaining to his parliament that it is no good tempting Him, "the more I so work, the worse I speed," and then comes one of the few alliterative lines in the piece: "The bolder in bicker I bid Him battle," the less heed He takes; and if he tempts Him by the deadly sins He overthrows him with the opposite virtues. He never went to school, and yet the devil saw Him arguing with the doctors. He works so many miracles that Satan can't make out who He is.

He is so wonderful in life,
I cannot know well what He is.
I would He had ended our strife;
He is out of our books, and we out of His.

Satan then says that since he first began to tempt our Lord, he never saw Him change color, though he cannot forget that once Jesus reproved him, nor can he discover where He gained His knowledge and His miraculous powers. Then in the following stanza he describes the Transfiguration:

I followed Him once into a place,
To a mountain upon a height;
Peter, James and John there was,
Ely and Moses stood there upright.
I would have seen Jesus' face,
But I might not, it shone so bright;
In the soothfast sun closed it was,
The bright beams blinded my sight.

He then tells how he tried to hinder the prophesies of our Lord's death being fulfilled, because their fulfilment meant ruin to him and his devils, and how he set Pilate's wife to stop it. The action of the poem now becomes more dramatic after Satan has described the effect our Lord's death, which he has just witnessed, had upon him. He lost his senses, for when our Lord's side was pierced with a spear the devil recognized Him, but now he can't discover where the soul of Jesus is gone; so, lest He should come and attack hell, the devils must prepare and try to tear Him from top to toe. Obedient to their master, the devils chained up the gates and barred them in the part of hell containing the good souls. Then follow the finest stanzas in the poem and some of the most original, in their

application of the twenty-third Psalm, to the gates of hell instead of to those of heaven:

"Ah! now," said Jesu, "ye princes fell;
  Open the gates that ever shall last,
And let in your king of bliss to hell."
  The devils asked Him then in haste,
"Who is the king of bliss Thou dost of tell;
  Weenest Thou to make us all aghast?"

"Strong God and king of might,
  I am Lord and king of bliss;
Overcomer of death and mighty in fight!
  Everlasting gates open wide!
Both peace, mercy, truth and right,
  I bought them at once and made them kiss;
Everlasting gates open on high,
  And let in your King to take out His!"

Lucifer then answers that God condemned Adam to hell forever, and as our Lord is of Adam's seed he claims Him, for there is no return from hell for any one who has once entered. Our Lord answers:

There is a bound hell, but this is free;
The bound hell was ordained for you.
For what man forfeited through a tree,
Through a tree again is he bought now.

Then He tells Lucifer that He came from the Godhead and took flesh sinlessly from a pure virgin, and when Adam sinned He made atonement for him, therefore the devil has no claim to him now. Lucifer answers that our Lord's words are in vain, for though it is certainly true that he lost heaven through his pride, yet he hopes to get there again; but Christ tells him such words are idle. When he was in heaven he had much joy, and so had all his companions, but it soon ceased. Lucifer then replies:

In this place I have dwelt in woe and pain,
  More than these four thousand years:
Help me unto that bliss again,
  The which I lost for my pride here;
For there it is merry in certain
  To dwell with royal angels clear.

Christ replies that He made Lucifer of nothing, and set him in heaven above all the angels, where he might still have been in rest and peace; but when He left His seat in heaven and gave it to the devil on His return Lucifer refused to give it up, and said he was worthier to sit there and never repented of his sin. Adam, on the contrary, wept and sighed and asked for mercy and oil of grace after his fall, so the Father sent His Son to die for him, and from His side when pierced came out the "dear-worthiest" oil that ever was.

In my Father's name of heaven,
Open the gates of hell to me.

Like lightning the gates burst asunder and our Lord enters and

takes out Adam and all the elect, who join in singing a song of thanks.

"A, ha!" said Adam, "my God I see;
He that made me with His hand!"
"I see," said Noah, "where cometh He
That saved me both on water and land!"
Quoth Abraham, "I see my God so free,
That saved my son from bitter bands!"
Said Moses, "These tables He gave to me,
His law to preach and understand."

* * * * * * * * * * *
* * * * * * * * * * *

Our Lord then took them by the hand,
And brought them to the place of bliss.

Thus Christ "harrowed hell" and led His lovers to Paradise, but He would not touch the other hells, where the black fiends and lost souls lie bound forever. Then all hell reproved Lucifer, charging him with cowardice; but the devil justified himself by saying how many souls of men he had brought there, even our Lord. Why were the other devils such fools as to let them go? They reply they could not help it; Christ came and took them, and Beelzebub says he barred up the gates "with locks, and chain, and bolt, and pin," but with one word of Christ's they were burst open and He came in.

He bound me and down we cast;
It boots not us to strive with Him.
When the dreadful doom is come and past,
Our endless pain is then to begin.

The scene in hell closes here, and the remainder of the poem is a description of Our Lord's Resurrection and the events that followed it, up to the Assumption of our Blessed Lady. The poet assures his readers that there is no trifling in this tale, and that it is appointed to be read on the first Sunday in Lent; that it tells how Christ humbled the devil, and concludes with praying that He may help us all into heaven.

This same Lambeth MS. contains an interesting poem called "The Mirror of the Periods of Man's Life," from which we can gather some idea of the kind of life a man of good means led at the period about 1430 A. D. In the edition edited by Mr. Furnivall it is divided into stanzas of eight lines each, but in the MS. it is written without breaks. In it the virtues and vices alternately bid for the man's soul. These poems on the seven ages of man are not uncommon in mediæval poetry. Part of "Ratis Raving," written about the latter half of the fifteenth century, is taken up with an account of these ages, and both that and "The Mirror" were probably known to Shakespeare, who has summed all that was ever written on the subject up in Jacques' immortal speech beginning "All the world's a stage."

"The Mirror" opens by the poet describing a dream, in which he saw a new-born child go into a wilderness with an angel friend on one side of him and an angel foe on the other. The world came and told the child it gave him food and clothes, and asked how he would pay it. Then came strength, courage, beauty, the commandments, the pleasures of this life, its sorrows and the works of mercy, all offering to lead the poor child to heaven or hell. Free will urged it to follow it; conscience said free will will make him mad, and he must learn to know discretion, which conscience alone can teach him, and prudence, and he must beware of recklessness.

When the child, at seven years old, passes from infancy to childhood, which lasts to fourteen here, to fifteen in "Ratis Raving," the good angel teaches him to honor his parents, the wicked angel to despise them. The good angel says:

> To father and mother thou honour yield;
> Love God and fear and be of good virtues.
> The wicked angel bade him be bold,
> To call both father and mother shrews.

The word "shrew," applied by us now to a scolding woman, originally meant a wretch or a wicked person.

The good angel teaches him to be mild, and curb his tongue; the wicked angel tells him to beat other children, and mock other folks with his tongue.

When he is fourteen his childhood ceases, and then the seven virtues and the seven deadly sins fight for his soul. About the age of twenty reason advises him to go to Oxford or learn law; lust advises him to be taught the harp and "giterue" and to play with piked staff and buckler, and to make merry at taverns with wild companions and wicked women, all night till day dawns. Conscience tells him these things are waste of time and of learning, but lust laughs and the young man says:

> Good conscience, go preach to the post;
> Thy counsel savoureth not to my taste.
> Conscience would bind me to skill,
> And make me his bondman.
> Farewell, conscience! Welcome freewill!
> I will learn no more good than I can.

After he is "twenty winters in age" the seven deadly sins each counsel him to indulge in their special vices. Gluttony tells him to eat outrageously night and day; anger to be bold and break the head of any one who offends him; sloth to learn in youth to take his rest; covetousness to win all he can; avarice to lock it in his chest.

> "Apparel thee properly," quoth Pride;
> See thy pockets pass the longest guise.
> Slash thy clothes both short and wide,
> Passing all other men's size."

The long pockets are probably an allusion to the "pocketing sleeves" worn in Henry IV.'s reign and also in Edward IV.'s time. The slashing of sleeves to show the shirt beneath and of other garments is shown in many old prints and satirized by Chaucer.

The seven virtues then counsel him to follow them, and conscience reproves him for his vices, but the young man refuses to listen in very spirited terms:

Thou wastest thy wind and spillest thy speech;
  Thy words to me are loth to hear.
If I did as thou dost teach,
  I should never make merry cheer.
Thinkest thou with thy hand heaven to reach?
  Thine arm will not be so long to yeere (certainty)
Now, Good Conscience, and thou wilt preach,
  Go steal a habit and be a friae.

Quoth man, "I play, I wrestle, I spring;
  These joys will never turn me fro.
I leap, I dance, I skip, I sing,
  I am so merry I cannot say ho!"
Quoth Conscience, "Thou shalt weep and wring
  When they take their leave to go."

The young man closes this incident by calling conscience an ignorant ass.

At forty years of age man is offered all the best that the world, strength, lust, courage and health have to offer. Truth and conscience advise him to get riches in youth that will help him in age. At fifty comes a change.

Now I am fifty years I wis,
  My hair beginneth to change its hue.
Quoth Conscience, "Flee from all vice,
  And use works of good virtue.
Let not thy works prove thee nyce (a fool);
  Look that thou ever be found true."

The man, however, prefers covetousness and the pursuit of riches. Over-hope or presumption makes him sin. Wan-hope or despair also oppresses him. At sixty he begins to repent; his eyes are dim and his hair hoary; youth taunts him, and he is ashamed.

How shall I reckon with God Almighty?
  I am ashamed wonder sore.
Quoth Conscience, "It were right
  To be holy now or nevermore."

Here follows one of the best verses in the poem:

"The candle of life thy soul did tend,
  To light thee home," reason did say.
Much of my candle in waste I spent;
  Many wicked winds wasted it away.
Scarcely I hold my candle end;
  It is past evensong of my day.
To reap my harvest where can I wend?
  My lands of virtues all fallow lay.

The man goes on to complain that he is like a stag at bay;

he knows not where to turn, but his best way is to flee to God and cry for mercy. Now comes a fine simile in the next stanza:

When youth was master, I was page;
We lived much in the fiend's service,
With rere (late) suppers and wicked outrage;
Lay long in bed loth to arise.
Now have I nought but wishes for wage,
And much reproach among the wise.
They that loved me in youth, hated me in age,
And unkindly they did me despise.

The "rere" or late suppers, Mr. Furnivall says, were complained of in 1300 by Waddington, in 1303 by Robert of Brunne in a poem called "Handling Sin," in which servants' late suppers are denounced, and by other writers.

At seventy youth accuses him of wasting and misusing all the gifts he gave him, such as health, strength and beauty; and the old man confesses his faults and complains that youth has stolen from him, while age has stolen upon him, and says pathetically:

Now am I sixty years and ten,
Young folks I find my foe;
Whenever they play, leap or renne (run)
They think in their way I go.
And when I meet with old men,
I cry, "This world is changed so."
I have no comfort except when
Each man tells another his woe.

At eighty his back is bowed, his blood is cold, his eyes are sore; where he was wont to leap he is now led; he grieves that he did not listen to conscience, who wonders at his repentance, but he thanks God for it.

At ninety his life is "but travail and woe." His limbs are bent; he walks with a staff; his teeth have fallen out; his speech is impaired; he has lost flesh and is but skin and bone.

Now am I under Fortune's wheel,
My friends forsake me every one;
And all the sins I loved so well,
Now know I well they are my foon (foes).

Three of the deadly sins—pride, lust and gluttony—now forsake him in his old age. Envy and wrath find he is no good, but sloth and covetousness claim him. Over-hope and wan-hope or presumption and despair then alternately vex him, and in his need the old man calls on the seven virtues to help him.

At a hundred he may stretch out his neck for death's sword; hell-hounds are barking for him, death and friends watching for him. Wan-hope and over-hope tempt him; unless God have mercy he will go to ruin.

Mine age is now a hundred year;
Little I drink and less eat.
On my back I bear my bier,
And all my friends me forget(e).

Fain they would that I dead were;
With angry words they do me threaten,
And say because I'm so long here
When I come home I shall be beaten.

The poem concludes by exhorting man to repent and learn to die; to look in this mirror and choose whether he will go to heaven or hell, and pray to God that after death we may all see His fair Face in perfect love. The poet ends by begging his readers to say an "Ave Maria" and a "Pater Noster" for his soul.

This same Lansbreth MS. contains two lovely little poems, so alike in metre and composition that the same anonymous writer must surely have written them. One is an old man's lament, called from the refrain with which each verse ends, "This World is but a Vanity;" the other is called "Revertere," the last word in each stanza. In the first the poet tells how as he was walking beside a holt under a hill he saw an old man sitting and weeping, who said to him:

Sometime I had the world at will,
With riches and with royalty;
And now it is turned all to ill,
The world is but a vanity.

The old man likens his life to a day and goes on to describe it according to the time of day. First he is like the morning, spotless, but now he is sinful.

Now I am old I weep therefore,
This world is but a vanity.

At mid-morn he learnt to walk and play in the street and to fight with his companions, and all he did then seemed to him sweet, but now he weeps for it.

At undern to school I was set,
To learn lore as other doth.
When my masted would me beat,
I would him curse, I was so wroth.
To learn good I was full loth,
I thought on joy and jollity.
Now, alas! for to say thee sooth,
This world is but a vanity.

This word "undern" meant under-noon, that is, from 9 o'clock to 12. At midday he was dubbed knight and learned to ride so that none was so brave as to stand his charge in battle, but this "too is vanity."

Where is become now all my pride,
My boldness and fair beauty?
Now from death I cannot hide,
This world is but a vanity.

At high noon he was crowned king, and the world was at his will; he fulfilled all his desires, but now age is crept on him; he is going down hill.

This world is but a vanity.
At mydonernoon I drooped fast,

My lust and liking went away;
From jollity my heart is past,
From royalty and rich array.
Man's life here is but a day,
Against the life that ever shall be,
And one thing only I dare say,
This world is but a vanity.

We have lost the beautiful words "undern," for before noon, and mydour noon," for mid-afternoon, meaning about 3 o'clock. At evensong time he walks with a staff and death seeks him.

When I am dead and laid in grave,
There is nothing then that saveth me
But good or evil that I done have,
This world is but a vanity.

Thus the day comes to night, when he loathes his life; doleful death possesses him, and "in cold clay now shall he cling," which is the only alliterative line in the poem.

Thus an old man I heard mourning,
Beside a holt under a tree;
God grant us His bliss everlasting,
This world is but a vanity.

The poem "Revertere" follows immediately in the MS. and seems evidently meant for a companion piece. The second title is "In English Tongue Turn Again." The poet here describes how he went out hawking with falcon and spaniel and put up a pheasant and flew his falcon at it. He ran on himself, but tripped over a briar, which made him turn back, for on every leaf was written in Latin, *Revertere.*

Revertere is as much to say
In English tongue as turn again:
Turn again, man, I thee pray,
And think heartily what thou has done.

Of thy living bethink thee rife (abundantly),
In open and in privacy.
That thou mayst come to everlasting life,
Take to thy mind Revertere.

It was noon on a summer's day that he went hawking, and this summer heat is like man rushing into all kinds of sin in his hot youth; but he must take to heart the advice "Revertere," and turn back.

Youth beareth the hawk upon his hand,
When jollity forgetteth age:
This hawk is man's heart, I understand,
For it is young and of high romage (roaming).

Man's heart, like the falcon, is flown after prey instead of to God, and youth spares no thorns to get its pleasures.

He that searcheth the darkness of night,
And the mist of the morrowtide may see,
He shall know by Christ's might,
If youth can sing Revertere.

This hawk, man's heart in youth I wis,
Pursueth ever his pheasant-hen;

This pheasant-hen is likingness (pleasure),
And ever follow her these young men.
There is pleasure in every sin,
Venial and deadly whether it be;
With great pleasure he will begin,
But sorrow brings forth, Revertere.

Desire is the mother of every sin and leads the dance of all sorrow; youth often goes wrong, but it should "turn again," and remember that age will come and then it will be best to say and sing "Revertere."

Therefore every man bethink him well,
How little while is his dwelling;
As holy writ it doth tell
He shall not know without reading (lesinge).
A cock can crow his time midnight,
Which he knoweth well in his degree;
But his time he knoweth not aright
That can never well say Revertere.

Therefore be thou certain, oh! man, that there is none so poor a wretch as thou art.

Therefore pray we to heaven's king,
Every man in his degree,
To grant them bliss everlasting,
That this word well can say Revertere.

Here for the present our space warns us to pass over the other treasures in this volume, to which we hope some day to "Revertere."

DARLEY DALE.

ANCIENT SCOTTISH DEVOTION TO MARY.

THE study of the practices of piety which flourished in past ages can never be without profit. To those outside the Catholic Church it affords the best of object lessons in the identity of the religion cherished by their forefathers with the Catholicism of the twentieth century; for it shows in the clearest light that the true Church of Christ is the same in all lands and at all times. To the Catholic, also, the example of bygone days is equally useful; it cannot but kindle in his heart a more fervent zeal for observances deservedly beloved by his ancestors in the faith. Such is particularly the case with regard to the measure and kind of devotion paid to the Mother of God when Scotland was wholly Catholic.

Just about ten years before the storm of the Reformation burst upon the land, and while ominous clouds were already looming black upon the outlook of those who had eyes to see, the authorities of the Church in Scotland began too late to realize a fact which, more than anything else, was tending towards the success of the new doctrines among the unlettered classes; this was the culpable

neglect by the bulk of the parochial clergy of the regular and systematic instruction of the people in their religion. In addition to the promulgation of laws for the supplying of this need, care was taken to compile a brief summary of Catholic doctrine which might serve as a handbook to fit the clergy for the task newly expected of them. The book became known as "Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism," not because it had been that prelate's personal work, but rather because he had been more active than any of the other Bishops in bringing about its publication. Some extracts from it touching very beautifully upon devotion to the Blessed Virgin and expressing as they do the popular feeling at that period may serve as an introduction to the investigation of earlier ages. The spelling is modernized.[1]

The preface to the instruction upon the Ave Maria runs thus:

"We think it expedient for your instruction and spiritual edification to set forth to you a plain declaration of that heavenly salutation which the holy angel Gabriel (sent from the Blessed Trinity) proposed reverently to the glorious lady, the Virgin Mary, when he came to show to her the blessed incarnation of the Son of God.

. . . . . .

"Our Mother, the Holy Kirk, has had a use since the Apostles hitherto to propose to all young scholars and learners of Christ's religion certain principles and general documents for their necessary instruction in the doctrines of our Saviour Christ, among which the same heavenly salutation was given to be learned and to be said with the Pater Noster.

. . . . . .

"The same salutation should be counted one of the special prayers that a Christian man and woman ought to say, for suppose there is not in it any special petition expressed, yet when it is said distinctly, reverently and devoutly, it stirs up our minds in the faith of the blessed incarnation of Christ; it moves us to contemplation and remembrance of the great benefits of God, and especially that He has given Himself to us; it warns us to love God and thank Him for the same blessed incarnation; it makes us understand the execellent dignity of the Virgin Mary, who was chosen to be Mother of God; it causes us to honor God in her and also her in God; it moves the glorious Virgin to make intercession to her Son for us, and, finally, God Almighty, seeing our meekness, our faith, our contemplation, our love and thanksgiving, our intercession to His Mother, will have mercy upon us.

. . . . . .

[1] Archbishop Hamilton's Catechism, original edition. Fort-Augustus Library.

"'From this time all generations shall call me blessed.' How can this prophecy of the ordination of God be fulfilled better than when we say to her devoutly, *Ave Maria?* And suppose Turks, Jews, heretics and false Christian men and women will not love the Virgin Mary, and so fulfil this prophecy, yet all true, faithful and devout Christian men and women will love and honor her, saying with the angel, '*Invenisti gratiam apud Deum*'—'O glorious Lady, thou has found grace and honor with God.'

. . . . . .

"So, O Christian man, I exhort thee, learn to understand truly the same salutation and to say it devoutly to the glorious Virgin, beseeching Almighty God that where He has given so great abundance and fulness of grace to her, that He would by her intercession give to thee a drop of grace, whereby thou may be saved and come finally to the kingdom of heaven."

The deep devotion to the Blessed Virgin, so simply yet so eloquently expressed in these extracts, is no less apparent in the national life of the preceding centuries, if we but take the trouble to search out details. It is chiefly shown in the following ways:

1. The dedication of churches, chapels and altars in the name of Mary.
2. The traditional place-names of the country.
3. Special bequests in Mary's honor.
4. Pilgrimages to her shrines and wells.
5. The veneration paid to her images.
6. The cherished hymns of the people.

Some examples of each class will satisfactorily prove our case.

DEDICATION OF CHURCHES.

The naming of churches after the Blessed Virgin may not appear at first sight to be a very strong proof of special devotion to her; yet, on reflection, we cannot help acknowledging it as such. For how can the founder of any particular church express more publicly his special predilection for this or that saint than in the choice of the patron whose name the building is to perpetuate? We have only to place ourselves in such a position to realize to the full the significance of the action. When there is question of a church built by some religious order the devotion is still apparent, although it is displayed by a corporate body rather than by an individual. With this premise we may turn to the consideration of examples.

Benedictines have always shown such variety in their dedications that the choice of Our Lady as titular of any of their churches argues a particular love for her. Many abbeys owned by Black

Monks in Scotland were thus distinguished. One of these was Kelso, the first foundation in the country of Benedictines belonging to the fervent reform instituted in the Abbey of Tiron in Picardy. Kilwinning in Ayrshire, Lindores in Fifeshire, Lesmahago in Lanarkshire, Fyvie in Aberdeenshire—monasteries of the same body—were all styled St. Mary's. So also was the picturesque abbey, afterwards raised to the dignity of a cathedral, which still forms in its state of ruin the prominent object of interest on bleak Iona.

Cluniac Benedictines almost invariably dedicated their monastic churches to Our Lady. Their Scottish foundations were no exception. Paisley, the chief of these, was renowned not only for beauty of architecture, but for picturesqueness of site also. Crossraguel in Ayrshire, its daughter, was no less worthy of its heavenly patroness.

Cistercians, or White Monks, made the Blessed Virgin their titular in almost every case. In Scotland the order possessed as many as twenty-eight houses, and all except two or three were named after Mary. Among them were some of extraordinary beauty. The delicate carvings of Melrose are world-famed; Sweetheart, or New Abbey, near Dumfries, recalling as it does the wifely devotion of the Lady Devorgilla, who built it to enshrine the heart of her beloved husband, has a charm beyond mere loveliness; Dundrennan, Newbattle and Kinloss were all noble churches when in their glory.

We find a like practice as regards dedication existing among other religious. Many of the churches of both White and Black Canons had the Blessed Virgin as their titular. The stately Norman pile of Jedburgh, as well as the churches of Scone, Cambuskenneth, Holywood and Dryburgh are examples. Dominicans usually followed the same pious custom. Their houses in Scotland numbered twelve. The Carmelites did the same; their foundations were seventeen in number. Other orders named some of their churches after Our Lady. Among them the Franciscans, whose fine buildings at Glasgow and Aberdeen and probably others were named St. Mary's.

Among the churches served by the secular clergy the cathedrals claim first mention. Of these Aberdeen bore the title of St. Mary and St. Machar. Dornoch, in Sutherland, built by its Bishop, St. Gilbert, in honor of Our Lady, received in later ages his own name in addition. St. Mary's Abbey, on Iona, became the cathedral of the diocese of the Isles shortly before the Reformation.

To enumerate all the churches and chapels which, through the ength and breadth of Scotland, rejoiced in having the Mother of God as their titular would be an impossibility, not only on account of their number, but also because the title of so many has been

altogether lost sight of. It will, however, be of interest to trace some of them, scattered through the various ancient dioceses.

In the north Aberdeen is remarkable as having possessed several. In the city itself was one dedicated to *S. Maria ad Nives*, commonly known as the "Snow Kirk." It has now disappeared, though its ancient cemetery, called "Snow Cemetery," is still in use. Besides the Grey Friars' church already mentioned, King's College chapel was dedicated to Our Lady, as also two, if not three, chapels on or near the bridges over the Don and the Dee. In the cathedral the high altar and two others were named in her honor. The parish church of St. Nicholas had chapels to Our Lady of Pity, both in the upper church and in the crypt. The latter is still known as "Pitty Vault."

There were several of Our Lady's churches and chapels throughout the county. Among them were the churches of Auchindoir, Kintore, Glenmuick, Ellon, Fyvie, Deer and Monimusk. Chapels existed at Stoneywood, in the parish of Newhills, Rothmaise, in the parish of Rayne, Meldrum, where was also a holy well, and other localities. The chief one in the county, however, was that known as "The Chapel of the Garioch," which has given its name to a parish. It was founded at a date earlier than 1357, before which time Christian of Bruce, sister of Robert I. and Lady of the Garioch, made provision for a perpetual chaplain to say Mass there for her brother the King, her husband and herself. In 1384 Margaret, Countess of Douglas, made other foundations in the chapel, and after the battle of Harlaw, in 1411, Alexander, Earl of Mar, provided perpetual Masses for the souls of the slain, and Isabel, widow of the Baron of Balquhain, did the same for her six sons, who had fallen in that fight, and also for her deceased husband. St. Mary's thus became a collegiate institution, with at least six chaplains. Queen Mary Stuart when making her progress to the north, in 1562, spent a night at Balquhain Castle and assisted next morning at Mass in the chapel of the Garioch.

In the neighboring county of Banff, Cullen possessed a collegiate Church of St. Mary served by a provost and six prebendaries. It still exists and is remarkable for its handsome stone "Sacrament House" in the north wall of the chancel. Banff and Cabrach also had churches dedicated to Our Lady.

Turning to the still more northerly diocese of Caithness, we find many traces of similar devotion to Mary. Besides the Church of Kilmuir, in the parish of Kildonan, there were chapels bearing her name at Duncansbay and Sibster. Regarding the latter a Protestant writer of the eighteenth century says: "To the west of the town of Wick, at a mile's distance on the north side of the water,

stands ane old chapple called Marykirk, which the commons did superstitiously frequent on the first Sabbath after the new moon."[2] In the parish of Halkirk, were several chapels, but their dedications are no longer known to us. It may well be that some of those existing at Farr, in Sutherland, were Our Lady's. That at Loch Naver, for example, had a healing well which used to be visited on the first Mondays of February, May, August and November. Two of those months suggest the feasts of the Purification and Assumption. The writer already quoted thus mentions a chapel in the parish of Latheron, in Caithness: "Within a mile of the sea, upon the brink of this water (Dunbeath) is the chapel of Balclay. It's certain it was built in the time of Poperia, and I can give no further account of it."[3] Several other chapels once existed in the neighborhood, but their dedication cannot be traced.

Before leaving this northern district the writer cannot resist the temptation of quoting once more from the same quaint writer with reference to the absence of religious establishments so far north. "There are no apparent vestiges in this parish," he says, when referring to one of them, "of Popish monasteries, abbacies or other religious societies, and few or none in our countrey, being too cold a clime and barren a soyle for that fry to nestle in."[4]

In the diocese of Ross there were many dedications to Our Lady in the churches of Kilmuir, Wester and Lumlair and the chapels at Delny, Tollie and Ormondhill (still called Lady Hill). A chapel at Balnagowan, in the parish of Tarbat, known as St. Mary's, was served by several chaplains. This was the case at Delny also. The cathedral at Rosemarkie had a "Blessed Virgin's Aisle." One of the bells of the church bore the names of Mary and Boniface—the latter being the titular saint.

The diocese of Moray could claim many similar churches and chapels. Inverness had a parish church as well as a chapel and cemetery bearing Our Lady's name. There was a chapel at Duffus and another in the castle near Elgin, while at Kincragy was one in which John de Hay, in 1374, founded a chaplaincy for the benefit of his own soul and those of his progenitors and successors and of all the faithful. In the same diocese was the chapel of Our Lady of Grace, to which we shall have to return later.

In the diocese of the Isles were numerous dedications. In the island of Mull were Kilmorie, Kilmore and Tobermory. At the latter place was also a holy well. The island of Rum had Kilmory; in Skye were Kilmuir and another Kilmuir near Dunvegan Loch. South Uist had a Church of Our Lady at Howmore. North Uist

[2] Macfarlane's "Geographical Collection," A. D. 1726.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

had Kilmuir; Lingay, in its neighborhood, Kilmoor. At Pabby (Harris), on Island More (Holy Isles), and on St. Kilda were others, with a cemetery on the latter island. On Lewis was a church which a document of 1536 speaks of as "Our Lady in Barwas."

Argyle diocese had churches of the Blessed Virgin at Kilmore, Kilmory in Ardnamurchan, Kilmorie in Arran and Dunoon (probably). There were chapels at Glassary and at Scarbay in Jura. Fordun, the historian, mentions the latter as noted for miracles. Rothesay parish church coupled the names of St. Mary and Brioc in its dedication. At Strathlachlan and Lochgoilhead there is record of Lady altars in the churches.

Coming to the neighborhood of Glasgow we find the collegiate Church of St. Mary and St. Anne within the city, as well as a chapel of Our Lady and the Dominican and Franciscan churches. The cathedral had a Lady altar outside the Rood Screen, which may still be seen, and another altar in the nave besides one in the undercroft of the church. Rutherglen, Renfrew, Carstairs and Skirling had churches dedicated to her. The latter place had also a holy well bearing her name. Chapels existed near Dalpatrick, near Cambuslang, near Renfrew and at Parrokholm. At West Linton (Tweed-dale) was a chapel of St. Mary to which Christian, daughter of Sir Adam FitzGilbert, gave her lands of Ingolstun to support three chaplains. One of these was to say daily the Mass of the Holy Ghost; a second, that of the fatihful departed, and a third, the Mass of the day. No trace of the building now remains.[5] In the parish church of Inchinnan was a Lady altar, whose chaplain was supported by the revenues of a piece of land styled "Lady Acre." It is a curious fact that centuries after the church had become Protestant the incumbent was forced, in order to make his title good to the aforesaid land, to style himself "Chaplain of the Lady Altar." The case occurs nowhere else in Scotland in similar circumstances. The last charter granted by a minister under the ancient Catholic title was dated 1821. It began thus: "To all and sundry to whose knowledge these presents shall come, I, the Rev. William Richardson, Doctor in Divinity, Minister of the Gospel and of the Kirk and parish of Inchinnan, and undoubted chaplain of the altarage and altar, commonly called Our Lady's Altar, and as such, undoubted superior of the lands after mentioned, &c."[6] The property has now passed into lay hands.

To continue this branch of the subject would be wearying. With the enumeration of a few more notable churches dedicated to the

[5] The chief authorities followed in this branch of the subject are "Origines Parochiales Scotiæ," "Collections for the Shires of Aberdeen and Banff," *Registrum Episc. Morav., Reg. Episc. Aberdon.* and *Reg. Episc. Brechinen.*

[6] "New Statis. Account of Scot.," vol. vii., p. 132.

Blessed Virgin in other parts of the country we may, therefore, take leave of it. Dundee and Haddington parish churches, the Chapel Royal at Stirling, the collegiate churches of Lochwinnoch, Biggar, Lincluden, Maybole and elsewhere and the College of St. Mary in the University of St. Andrews are among the most important.

As regards altars of Blessed Mary, every cathedral possessed at least one—generally outside the Rood Screen. There was always one, too, in every church of any note, and not seldom more than one. St. John's, at Perth, had one in honor of the Annunciation and another of the Visitation. The collegiate Church of St. Giles, Edinburgh, had no less than five—the Lady altar, St. Mary and Gabriel, Our Lady and St. Roch, the Visitation and Our Lady of Pity. Many other instances of such altars will occur in the enumeration of the bequests made in honor of the Mother of God, but we may mention here a Blessed Virgin's aisle in the Grey Friars' church at Lanark and a Lady Chapel in Lanark parish church.

PLACE NAMES.

It is not necessary to repeat here the many examples of places called after Mary in such names as Kilmuir, Kilmory, to which allusion has already been made. Another form of the name is found in Marykirk, Kilmorach and Kilmarie (Forfarshire). Dalmary, or Maryfield, is in Stirlingshire, Maryholm in Kirkcudbrightshire, while "Marisland" occurs often in old charters. In Rossshire and in the Island of Mull are to be found St. Mary's Loch, St. Mary's Isle is in Kirkcudbrightshire, Mary Well in Forfarshire, Maryton in the same county, while Marynett occurs in connection with charters of fishings possessed by the abbey of Cambuskenneth. Maryhill, Marydale, Maryculter are other examples.

The places taking their names from the title "Our Lady" are even more numerous. Dunbar has "Our Lady's Lands;" Scone, "Our Lady Petie Land;" Strathisla, Banffshire, "Oure Lady Land." At Avoch, Ross-shire, is Lady Hill and at Elgin is another with a Mary Well close by. In Grange parish, Banffshire, are to be found another Lady Hill and Lady Well. A peat-moss belonging to the comechanged to Ladybank. There is a Ladyfield near Dundee, Ladychanged to Ladybank. There is a Ladyfield near Dundee, Ladybankis in Kincardineshire and Ladyloan in Forfarshire. At Lanark "Our Lady's Akr" is still commemorated in Lady Acre Road. There was a Lady Acre at Kilwinning also. At Dailly, in Ayrshire, is Ladyglen at Kirkcolm in Wigtownshire, Lady Cave and Lady Bay, while Ladycroft, Ladyburn, Ladykirk and Ladywell occur in many parts of Scotland. A whole parish as well as a street has

been named from the Lady Well by the Molendinar Burn at Glasgow. On the land of Prestbuie Farm, in the parish of Whithorn, is a spring called Mother Water. The town of Motherwell, near Glasgow, mentioned as early as a charter of 1352, takes its name from a holy well which was formerly treasured there.[7]

In connection with this branch of the subject may be mentioned fairs held in honor of Our Lady. Many of these were instituted on account of the dedication of the particular parish church to her; the patronal feast bringing a concourse of people to the church would give rise to the fair in question. The very word "fair" is derived from the Latin *feria*, a holiday. But there are other fairs bearing Our Lady's name which do not show a like origin. Some examples may be quoted, without reference to the particular reason of the institution of each.

Candlemas fairs were held by royal authority at Biggar in Lanarkshire, Campbeltown in Argyleshire, Doune in Perthshire, Kinloss in Moray and other places. It is to be noted that when fairs were thus granted the particular feast of the Blessed Virgin was designated in a way differing from our present custom. "Lady Day," for instance, did not as a rule mean the Annunciation, but the Immaculate Conception, as appears from a grant made to Ellon. The Annunciation always figures as "Lady Day in Lentron," the Assumption is styled "Lady Day in Harvest," the Nativity "Latter Lady Day." There was a "Marymas Fair" at Ellon and also at Geddes in Nairnshire on the Annunciation. A more customary day was the Nativity, as at Greenlaw in Berwickshire, Inverury in Aberdeenshire, Ballinclach in Wigtownshire, Bonnakettle in Kirkcudbrightshire and Dunbar. Inverness, Jedburgh, Dunnet in Caithness and Kilmalie in Argyleshire held Mary Fairs on the Assumption. Some fairs lasted for three or more days.[8]

BEQUESTS IN HONOR OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

Whatever may be thought as to the naming of churches after the Mother of God, no one will dispute the fact that special bequests in her honor are indubitable proofs of particular devotion to her. Many examples of the kind may be called from the records of cathedrals, churches and religious houses.

The register of the diocese of Moray shows us that the parish church of Elgin, the cathedral city, was dedicated to St. Giles, and that it had an altar of Our Lady to which the citizens made frequent donations. Thus in 1343 Adam de Berewyc gave a stone of wax

[7] Much information has been gathered from Mackinlay's "Pre-Reformation Church of Scotland and Scottish Place-names."

[8] Sir D. Marwick's "Scottish Fairs and Markets."

yearly for the sustentation of the "Blessed Virgin's Light." John de Moray, we may mention, made a similar donation, at a later period, to Our Lady's altar in the cathedral. William Pop, burgess of Elgin, "reverently desiring to honor the Son through the Mother, and the Mother through the Son, acknowledging her as the special refuge of the faithful and the never-failing helper of all men," established a perpetual chaplaincy at the altar of "the gorious Virgin Mary, Mother of God," in the church of St. Giles. Richard, son of John, another burgess, provided for another chaplain at the same altar, who should celebrate Mass for his own soul and for the souls of his father and mother and all the faithful departed.

At the Lady altar in the cathedral there was at least one special chaplaincy. At Elgin, as well as in all cathedrals and many monasteries at that period, the "Mary Mass' was sung to note every morning after the Office of Prime, in addition to the Mass of that particular day, which was celebrated at a later hour. At Elgin another daily Mass of Our Lady was celebrated in the chapel of St. Thomas the Martyr in the cemetery, where five chaplains had been provided for five daily Masses—that of St. Thomas, sung to note, and others of the feast of the day, the Blessed Virgin, St. John Baptist and the faithful departed. When we bear in mind that the city possessed a Lady Chapel in the castle on Lady Hill, a church of Black Friars and one of the Grey Friars—in both of which much was daily done for Mary's glory—we are bound to conclude that Elgin bore its share in honoring her.[9]

Turning to the records of Aberdeen Cathedral, we find that in addition to the daily sung Mass of the Blessed Virgin, at which the canons were required to assist, there was a weekly Mass of Our Lady of Compassion every Wednesday, provided for by Alexander Kyd, one of the precentors, and celebrated at the Lady altar in the nave. The feast of the Visitation was kept in this church with an octave, and on festivals rich tapestries representing scenes in the life of the Blessed Virgin were hung in the sanctuary. In 1420 Thomas de Lyn provided for three Masses weekly in the Black Friars' church in the city, at the altar of Our Lady, and in other ways, as we shall see later, Aberdeen was notable for honoring Mary.[10]

The register of Brechin affords similar examples. At the Lady altar in the cathedral were several chaplaincies. One of them was for a Mass of Requiem for the founder, to be said every Wednesday. A perpetual daily Mass was endowed in this cathedral by one of the canons, and on Saturdays it was to be always that of the Blessed

[9] *Reg. Episc. Morav.*
[10] *Reg. Episc. Aberdon.*

Mary. David, Earl of Crawford and Lord of Lindsay, provided in 1472 for the daily singing during the chief Mass of the *Ave Gloriosa* in honor of Our Lady, "for the salvation of his own soul, the souls of his predecessors and successors and the souls of all the faithful." In the chapel of St. Mary Magdalen a weekly Mass was offered in honor of the Blessed Trinity, Blessed Mary the Virgin and Blessed Magdalen. In the city stood the Hospital of St. Mary, to which other chaplaincies were attached. Not far from Brechin, in the barony of Menmuir, was a hermitage bearing Mary's name, while another of her chapels existed at Kermyle.[11]

The city of Perth was particularly remarkable for its devotion to the Blessed Virgin. Its great Church of St. John Baptist, of cathedral-like proportions, had gained for the city the familiar designation of "St. John's Town." It measured 207 feet in length. Attached to this church were no less than forty chaplaincies, five of which were in honor of Our Lady. Thus Alan de Myrtoun, burgess of Perth, founded an altar of the Blessed Virgin in 1431 and endowed it with lands and tenements for the support of its priest. In 1491 Robert de Chalmer and Catherine his wife made provision for a chaplain at St. Andrew's altar, "in honor of the Virgin Mary and the Presentation of our Saviour in the Temple." In the same year Master James Fenton, Vicar of Tippemuir, endowed the same altar with another chaplaincy in honor of Our Lady of Consolation. Patrick Wallis, burgess, in 1513, gave his dwelling house to provide a rental for the altar of the Annunciation. In addition to these there was an altar styled "Our Lady's Grace," or the Visitation, to which the chaplain, Sir Simon Young, added in 1514 an increased annual income.

In the town itself, near the bridge, stood a beautiful Lady chapel, built, according to the pious custom of Catholic ages, to provide a little sanctuary where the wayfarer might find a quiet retreat in which to retire for a few moments from the din and bustle of a city's traffic, to breathe a prayer to the Mother of God for a blessing upon the day's toil. It may have been that in this, as in similar chapels, the Holy Sacrifice was offered at an early hour for those about to start on a journey—another thoughtful provision of the ages of faith. Another chapel of the Blessed Virgin bore the name of Allareit, a corruption of Loreto. Like similar chapels in other localities of England and Scotland, it was a replica of the holy house.

Besides the above there were other sanctuaries of Mary. A noble Dominican church bore her name, served by an order always devout to her. It was enriched at various times with endowments to promote her honor. The Carmelites—Our Lady's own order—pos-

[11] *Reg. Episc. Brech.*

sessed a fine church in the city. Another was served by Carthusians, who are bound by their rule to recite daily the Office of the Blessed Virgin.[12]

Edinburgh was another city which may be cited as an example of devotion to Mary. The records of the collegiate church of St. Giles afford much information on the subject, and it will be interesting to note some of the benefactions made by the citizens towards that object.

In 1362 we find John de Allyncrum giving all his lands at Craigcrook to provide a chaplain at the altar of the Blessed Virgin. In the following year William More, Lord of Abercorn, endows a chaplaincy at the same altar with his lands of Ravelston. William Hare at about the same time makes a further donation of land for a like purpose. A long list of annual rentals coming to the altar in the year 1369 enumerates benefactions which though of small value at that date must have become of considerable worth in after time. In many instances it is stated "the land belongs to the Blessed Mary." In 1426 John de Alncrum, perhaps a descendant of the earlier donor of that name, bestows upon the altar half a mark every year. Alan Brown, burgess, in 1484, provides for the maintenance of a wax candle to burn continually on the "hers" or stand before it. At about the same date James Townys, another burgess, endows the altar of Our Lady of Pity, situated near the north door of the choir, with a yearly revenue of 14 marks. Richard Hopper, in 1502, makes an annual bequest to the altar of Our Lady and St. Roch, standing in the new aisle of St. Thomas the Martyr. This Richard was the founder of the altar of the Visitation also. In 1513 Sir Alexander Lauder de Blyth, Provost of Edinburgh, bestows an annual rental of 55 marks upon the chaplaincy at the altar recently founded by him in the new aisle of the Virgin and St. Gabriel. He also endowed a lamp in the same chapel to burn from St. Michael's Day to the feast of the Purification every year. John Stury, "for the welfare of his soul," made a similar bequest of a perpetual candle before Our Lady's altar. In 1535 Sir Adam Ottirburn, provost, gives certain yearly rents to provide prayers for others and a dirge for himself after death. The burgh records relate that on January 22, 1556, "the provost, baillies and counsale . . . thinks expedient . . . to repair Our Lady's altar and make an aisle thereof." This restoration and improvement in St. Giles', at the expense of the burgh, is a proof of the strong hold of religion upon the minds of men in authority.

The Chamberlain's accounts of the reign of James III. mention an act of devotion shown by the King in the above church:

[12] Lawson's "Book of Perth."

Item on Sanct Mongoy's da (*i. e.*, St. Mungo or Kentigern) in Edingh.
to the King to offer in Sanct Geyllis Kirk.....xviii. s.
Item, the same da to our Lady's licht..... ix. s.

A flight of steps, "callit Our Lady's Steppis," led up to the north-east corner of the church from the street. Their designation was owing to a statue of the Blessed Virgin which stood near them. The very bells of St. Giles' Church spoke of devotion to Mary. The Lady bell was melted for cannon at the time of the Reformation. Another, known as the Vesper bell, bore the inscription:

O Mater Dei: Memento Mei: Anno: D: M: IIII.

The "great bell" bore a representation of the Virgin and Child. Edinburgh, like many other towns, had a Carmelite friary as well as a Dominican house, each, no doubt, possessing a Lady chapel. Holyrood Abbey, too, must have had its Lady altar in common with other religious houses.[13]

Those registers of cathedral and abbey churches which yet remain to us teem with examples of donations similar to those above quoted. Sir Duncan Sybald, for instance, in 1286, made an annual grant to the Cistercian abbey of Cupar of a stone of wax and four shillings to provide lights for the Mary Mass. James, Lord Hamilton, granting in 1459 ground for the buildings of Glasgow College, made it a condition that the scholars should for all future time sing daily an *Ave Maria*, "on their bended knees," for the welfare of his soul. But enough has been said to illustrate the practical character of the devotion of all classes towards the Blessed Virgin during the ages of faith.

PILGRIMAGES.

Scotland possessed many noted sanctuaries of Our Lady which were an attraction to devout pilgrims. One of the most popular of these was the Church of St. Mary, Whitekirk, in the County of Haddington. In the twelfth century it became the property of the canons of Holyrood. From an early period this church became the resort of pilgrims on account of a much venerated statue of the Blessed Virgin which was kept there. Scottish historians relate that when Edward III. of England invaded Scotland, in 1356, a sailor of his fleet, having entered the church with some companions, was tempted by the sight of the costly jewels that adorned the image to try to pluck off a ring from the finger. The story goes that a crucifix, falling from a height, dashed out his brains as he was making the sacrilegious attempt. The ship, too, which was bearing off the spoils of many sacred buildings, is said to have been wrecked in a violent storm off Tynemouth. It was to this church

[13] *Vide passim*, Cameron-Lees, "St. Giles, Edinburgh."

that the renowned Aeneas Silvius Piccolomini, afterwards Pope Pius II., made a pilgrimage on landing in the country after a tempestuous voyage. The walk barefoot over frozen paths for ten miles produced a chronic rheumatism from which he suffered for the rest of his life.

Another place of pilgrimage of scarcely less note was the church known as "the Lady Kirk of Kyle." It stood in the parish of Monkton, in Ayrshire. Its renown may be gathered from the fact that James IV., a sovereign remarkable for his devotion to pilgrimages, never passed near this church without making an offering. A few ruins are all that now remain of this once famous sanctuary. Newhaven, near Edinburgh, had a chapel dedicated to Our Lady and St. James, which was a favorite resort of pilgrims. It is recorded of James IV. that he made an offering of fourteen shillings in this "Ladye Chapell." Newhaven itself, which owed its origin to the prosperous trading times of that monarch, was originally called "Our Lady's Port of Grace."

In 1472 the people of Ayr founded in their town a house of Observantine Friars. In the church in after years was preserved a statue of the Blessed Virgin which became the object of much devotion. "A statue of the Virgin Mary in this convent," remarks a Protestant writer, "is said to have wrought many miracles; fictions these, which no doubt gained the Grey Friars some credit and some profit."[14] A Catholic will more readily accept the testimony of a Franciscan writer, Wadding, as to the fact, without subscribing to the sneering comment given above. James IV. in his visits to Ayr used to bestow generous donations on the friars, and there is a record of £10 offered there by James V. in 1530. The old parish church, as it is called, built after the Reformation, occupies the site of this popular sanctuary, not a vestige of which now remains. A spring of excellent water, still known as "Friars' Well," is all that recalls its memory.

Musselburgh, in the vicinity of Edinburgh, possessed a chapel renowned for the miracles wrought there and roused the spite and bigotry of writers of Protestant tendency. This was the Loreto Chapel, built about 1533, by a hermit named Thomas Douchtie. He had made a pilgrimage to the holy house and had brought back a small portion of the building, which he enshrined in the little chapel which the donations of the faithful enabled him to raise. This became known as "St. Allareit, or "Lariet," both words being corruptions of "Chapelle of Lauret." Many relics were in course of time enshrined there, and devotion to Our Lady drew crowds of pilgrims to the place. A proof of the widespread attraction to

[14] Chalmers, "Caledonia," Ayr.

this holy shrine is furnished by the visit made to it on foot by James V., in 1536, when about to start for France to bring home a bride. A Protestant writer with uncalled-for rancor remarks upon the King's action: "If the pilgrimage helped to bring Mary of Guise to Scotland, Scotland had little cause for gratitude therefor." The bride whom James won by that journey was Magdalene of France, the darling of the Scottish nation, whose early death after a few months of wedded happiness brought grief to all, and not the much suffering Queen Regent, so hated by Knox and his crew for her staunch Catholicity. The sneer is therefore robbed of its sting. This famous chapel fell a victim to the rage of the Reformers. It was cast down and its stones used to build the Tolbooth of the burgh.

There was another favorite place of pilgrimage for northern Scotland near Fochabers in Banffshire. It was called the "Chapel of Our Lady of Grace." Long after the Reformation, and even to some extent up to this day, the veneration of the people continued unabated. About the year 1638 all that remained of the building was thrown down in order to stop the resort of Catholics thither, though to no purpose. A writer of the eighteenth century bears witness to the multitudes in his day that flocked to the place from the Western Isles. "Nothing short of violence," he says, "can restrain their superstition." Protestants, even, in recent times have taken pleasure in visiting the sacred spot and drinking from its holy well. An account of the devotion of a noble Catholic to this sanctuary has been preserved to us in the narrative left by her chaplain, Fr. Blakhal, of the yearly visit of the Countess of Aboyne, in the seventeenth century:

"Shortly heirafter, in the octave of the Assumption of Our Lady, she did go to the Bogge of Gight to see her mother-in-law, my Ladye Marqueis of Huntly, and go from thence a pillgrimage, two milles, to Our Lady of Grace, in Murray Land. It had bein of old a very devote place, and many pillgrimages had bein made to it from al the partes in the Northe of Scotland; but then there was nothing standing of it but some brocken walles, which the minister made throw downe within the chappell, to hinder the people to pray there. . . . She used to make that pilgrimage every year so long as she hed health to do it, a mater of threttie (30) milles from her owne house, wherof she made two of them afoot, and barefooted, next to the chapel."[15]

There was another Banffshire Lady Well which was an object of pilgrimage even after the Reformation. This was at Ordiquhill,

[15] "A Brieffe Narration," by Gilbert Blakhal (Spalding Club), p. 71. "Bog of Gight" is the old name for Gordon Castle.

not far from Banff. It was reputed miraculous and became the subject of legislation on the part of the Presbyterian Kirk. In the General Assembly that met at Linlithgow in 1608 this well and that in Speyside, referred to above, were vigorously reprobated. A specimen of the hatred of pilgrimages after the Reformation is seen in the action of Assembly of the Kirk, held at Aberdeen in 1630. After fining a lady £5 for sending her child to St. Fiacre's well to obtain a cure in sickness, it ordained that any future pilgrim to a reputed holy well should be "answered in penalty and repentance in such degree as fornicators" were.

There were many other sacred places dedicated to Our Lady which were frequented by the devout. Among the holy wells that bore her name were not a few to which miraculous powers were attributed. The number of such wells cannot now be accurately estimated. In a list compiled in 1883 by Mr. J. Russel Walker for the Society of Antiquaries, seventy-five Mary Wells are mentioned, but it is probable that many have been lost sight of.

SACRED IMAGES.

It is interesting to note in this connection certain features of devotion to Mary which some persons in these days are inclined to stigmatize as foreign in character. Yet there is unmistakable evidence that they were common to Scottish churches before the Reformation. These were the clothing and crowning of statues, placing jewels upon them, burning votive candles before them, carrying them in procession and the like.

We may take Aberdeen Cathedral as an example. The chief image of the Mother of God honored in that church was that of Our Lady of Pity, which stood in the nave near an altar dedicated to her. The particular title, continually met with in Scotland as in England, has been considered by many authorities on the subject as equivalent to what we style in these days a *Pietà*. The statue at Aberdeen, however, represented the Mother bearing the Divine Infant in her arms; for the crowns belonging to the figures are spoken of in an inventory as those of "the Blessed Virgin and her little Son, Jesus."

The image in question was greatly venerated. Alexander Kyd, precentor of the cathedral, gave a yearly revenue to provide two candles to burn continually in its honor. Canon Clatt presented a candle-holder, upon which the faithful might burn their tapers before it. Bishop Elphinstone provided for it a large candelabrum, which on feast days was filled with lighted candles. On great occasions the statue was clothed in a rich mantle and shoes set with beryls.

Votive hearts of silver hung near it, and other offerings spoke of graces received through prayers said there.

A smaller image of solid silver, the gift of Master Andrew Lyall, another member of the chapter, in 1499, used to be carried in procession on festivals by order of Bishop Elphinstone, who granted an indulgence to all who should take part. A still smaller image of precious metal was exposed in the sanctuary on great feasts, together with relics and other sacred objects.[16]

At a later period an ancient wooden statue, which once stood in the chapel of the Brig of Dee, was removed to the cathedral by Bishop Dunbar, who died in 1532. After escaping destruction, several times attempted without success, at the hands of Protestants, the statue was finally carried to the continent and eventually placed in the church of the Augustinians at Brussels, the Infanta Isabella having arrayed it in a magnificent robe and many of her own jewels. It was hidden away during the French Revolution, and afterwards placed in the church of Finisterre, Brussels. There it is still honored under the title of "Our Lady of Good Success."[17]

A statue in the cathedral of St. Andrews was known as the "Douglas Virgin." Archibald, Earl of Douglas, bestowed upon it a yearly revenue to provide two candles to burn continually before it. The image of Our Lady of Consolation stood near one of the altars in the nave of Glasgow Cathedral. Archbishop Blacader arranged that every evening after Compline the canons should assemble round it and there sing one of the anthems of the Blessed Virgin with the proper versicle and prayer. The same prelate founded a perpetual chapaincy at the altar of Our Lady of Pity.

Many bequests are to be found in mediæval documents for lights before statues and altars. Some have been already quoted. The burgh records of Dunfermline contain many references to "Our Lady's lichts" in the abbey church, which were provided for by revenues called "Our Lady's licht silver."

Near Haddington stood a Cistercian abbey for nuns. On one occasion, when the buildings were in extreme danger of being washed away by a flood in 1358, a nun is said to have saved them from destruction by bringing to the edge of the water a statue of Our Lady.

These examples will be sufficient to show the nature of the honor paid to images of the Mother of God in Catholic Scotland. But there is another way in which the representation of her figure was made use of, no less important in testifying to the love in which she was held. This was by employing it in official seals. That a

[16] *Regis. Episc. Aberd.*

[17] Waterton, "Pietas Mariana Brit."

cathedral, abbey, monastery or church should do this, especially when Our Lady happened to be the titular patron, is not remarkable; but it is striking to find civil corporations choosing the figure of the Blessed Virgin in such a case. Among the burghs which did this were those of Dundee, Newhaven, Jedburgh, Irvine, Selkirk, Rutherglen, Crail, Cullen and Inverness. The latter town substituted, subsequently to 1439, the crucifix on the shield—the present arms of the burgh.[18]

POPULAR HYMNS AND SONGS.

Striking evidence of the love of Catholics in Scotland for the Blessed Virgin is to be found in the traditional songs and hymns cherished by those who have always preserved the faith. In two splendid volumes entitled "Carmina Gadelica," Mr. Alexander Carmichael has embodied the labors of forty years spent in collecting orally more than two hundred specimens of the traditional hymns of the people of the Highlands and Western Isles.[19] These Carmina are given in their original Gaelic, accompanied by a translation made by the compiler. All are deeply religious in character, consisting of invocations of the Blessed Trinity, Our Blessed Lord, His Mother and the saints in all the circumstances of daily life. It is remarkable how constantly the thought of Mary runs through almost all, even when the context may not seem to suggest it. Whenever, for instance, Jesus is mentioned, He is nearly always styled "Son of Mary Virgin." In invocations of St. Michael, St. Columba, St. Bridget or other saints Mary's name is continually introduced. It is as though the hymn wanted completeness if no mention were made of the "Queen of all Saints." Examples alone can give an adequate idea of the devotional beauty of these truly poetic songs, some of them dating from the eighth century.

A GENERAL SUPPLICATION.

God, listen to my prayer,
Bend to me Thine ear,
Let my supplication and my prayers
Ascend to Thee upwards;
Come, Thou King of Glory,
To protect me down,
Thou King of life and mercy,
With the aid of the Lamb,
Thou Son of Mary Virgin,
To protect me with power,
Thou son of the lovely Mary,
Of purest, fairest beauty.

Another in which Our Lady is mentioned, though not directly invoked, is the following:

Thou Son of the Mary of graces,
Of exceeding white purity of beauty,
Joy were it to me to be in the fields of Thy riches.
O Christ, my beloved,
O Christ of the Holy Blood,
By day and by night I praise Thee.

[18] Laing, "Ancient Scottish Seals."
[19] "Carmina Gadelica," Constable & Co., Edinburgh.

A more direct appeal for the help of Our Lady is to be found in that entitled:

A PRAYER.

O God,
In my deeds,
In my words,
In my wishes,
In my reason,
And in the fulfilling of my desires,
In my sleep,
In my dreams,
In my repose,
In my thoughts,
In my heart and soul always,
May the blessed Virgin Mary
And the promised Branch of Glory dwell.
Oh! in my heart and soul always
May the blessed Virgin Mary
And the fragrant Branch of Glory dwell.

There are invocations of Our Lady at the kindling of the fire:

I will raise the hearth-fire
As Mary would.
The encirclement of Bride and of Mary
On the fire and on the floor,
And on the household all.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Who are those watching over my sleep?
The fair loving Mary and her Lamb.

The following are prayers before fishing or the chase:

O Mary, tender-fair, gentle-fair,
Avoid thou to me the silvery salmon dead on the salt sea.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

O Mary, fragrant Mother of my King,
Crown thou me with the crown of thy peace;
Place thine own regal robe of gold around me,
And save me with the saving of Christ.

Before traveling is used the following:

The fair white Mary still uphold me,
The Shepherd Jesu be my shield.

Here are some beautiful herding blessings:

Mary, thou Mother of Saints,
Bless our flocks and bearing kine;
Hate nor scath let not come near us,
Drive from us the ways of the wicked.

Another, after the invocation of the Blessed Trinity, runs:

May Mary the mild keep the sheep.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

May the Son of Mary Virgin preserve the flocks.

Another is for singing when the sheep are being driven to summer pastures:

Shield, oh shield us, pure Virgin of nobleness.
Mary beloved! Mother of the White Lamb,

There are songs for reaping, grinding corn, milking the cow and other household duties. Many of the sleep consecrations or bed blessings are full of charm:

I lie down to-night
With fair Mary and with her Son.

I am lying down to-night as beseems
In the fellowship of Christ, Son of the Virgin golden.

I am lying down to-night
With Mary mild and with her Son;
With the Mother of my King,
Who is shielding me from harm.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

God and Mary and Michael
And the cross of the Nine Angels fair
Be shielding me.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

O God! O Mary of glory!
O Jesu! Son of the Virgin fragrant,
Sain ye us from the pains everlasting
And from the fire fierce and murky.

With a version of the *Salve Regina* we bring these quotations to an end:

Hail Mary! Hail Mary!
Queen of Grace, Mother of Mercy;
Hail, Mary, in manner surpassing,
Fount of our health, source of our joy.

To thee we, night and day,
Erring children of Adam and Eve,
Lift our voice in supplication,
In groans and grief and tears.

Such are some of the proofs, gleaned from various sources, of the love which the people of Scotland, like those of all Catholic nations, bore towards the Blessed Mother of their Redeemer. Doubtless with greater research many more might be gathered, though these will serve their purpose. The devotion of centuries, the honor intended by fervent donors to witness their love in after ages—though neglected and forgotten by faithless descendants—must surely bear fruit. It would seem, indeed, that the seed sown so long ago is already showing blossom. Turn to the Catholic Directory for Scotland for proof. In the six dioceses which the country has possessed since the restoration of her hierarchy, as many as eighty-two churches at least will be found to rejoice in Our Lady as titular, either alone or in conjunction with another heavenly patron. Some of these, too, may be said to be the resuscitation of ancient Catholic dedications. Thus Aberdeen has still its cathedral of St. Mary; Dundee, Stirling, Haddington, Inverness, Selkirk, Jedburgh, Irvine, Banff, Leith, Kelso, Paisley, New Abbey, Maybole, Hamilton, Lanark and Dumfries can all boast of a church or chapel of Our Lady to replace the shrines of old. Edinburgh has its St. Mary's Cathedral, Glasgow its three churches under her patronage, Motherwell and Musselburgh their sanctuaries, Perth its beautiful shrine of Our Lady of Perpetual Succor, dominating the town once belonging to Mary by a thousand titles. The old Chapel of the Garioch lives again in the title of the church at Fetternear;

the ecclesiastical College of St. Mary at Blairs has replaced the Catholic foundation of Bishop Elphinstone in Aberdeen; St. Mary's at Fochabers, Speyside, revives the memories of Our Lady of Grace.

Mary has indeed come back to Scotland, even though her presence is ignored by so many thousands of the Scottish nation. Her name is lovingly and daily invoked for the conversion of Scotland, her images publicly honored, her altars rise again on every side. We may surely hope that the prayers poured forth and the Masses offered in her honor during the ages of faith, combined with the lasting worship paid her by her loyal children during centuries of persecution and ridicule and contempt, are beginning now to draw down from heaven more abundant showers of grace, and will in God's good time be still more fully answered in the return of the people of the land to the faith they once cherished so dearly.

MICHAEL BARRETT, O. S. B.

St. Benedict's Abbey, Fort-Augustus.

ANCIENT COMMERCE OF THE PHŒNICIANS IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.

PART I.

NO SEA has witnessed more vicissitudes in the history of the civilized world than the Mediterranean, by whose shores the empires of Aryan, Semite and Hamite nations have at various periods flourished and declined, the crumbling ruins of which still prove to the archæologist their former greatness. The best known are Greece and Rome, but they were not the first empires whose shores were washed by the blue waters of the Mediterranean—

"The wild sea, that moans with memories."[1]

Professor McCurdy says: "We are learning more clearly as each year of discovery goes by that what the Greeks and Romans were as civilizers and conquerors of a world we still call ancient, the Babylonians were to countries and peoples of an antiquity immeasurably more remote."[2] Again, "[recent research] seems to supply some ground for the conjecture of Professor Sergi and others that the southern shore of the Mediterranean was the home of a civilization far surpassing in antiquity anything that Carthaginian or Roman brought with them."[3]

---

[1] "Spanish Gypsy" (G. Eliot).

[2] "History, Prophecy and the Monuments," Vol. I., p. 185.

[3] *Athenæum*, Sept. 6, 1902.

It would be interesting to learn something of the people who first brought civilization to the western Mediterranean and first crossed its untraversed waters. In ages long anterior to Abraham and Moses it was the highway of commerce for the East (Babylonia, Egypt, etc.); the prophets spoke of Tyre and Sidon as the market of the known world,[4] and Scripture contains frequent references to the wealth of their merchants and the vast scale of their commerce. "They (the Phœnicians) taught international trade and navigation to the Greeks and then to the Romans. . . . The surviving [Aryan] empires only reached their gigantic stature by climbing on the shoulders of these Semitic adventurers. Not only were the Phœnicians the originators of a world-wide trade and of a far-sighted commercial policy unrivaled in ancient times, but their maritime supremacy has been the most enduring known to men."[5]

The beginings of navigation lie beyond all human memory. The poet, Horace,[6] thus praises the daring of the first man, who in a frail bark ventured out of sight of land:

> Illi robur et aes triplex
> Circa pectus erat, qui fragilem truci
> Commisit pelago ratem
> Primus, nec timuit praecipitem Africum. . .

It is not hard to understand how the ancients attributed this to the Phœnicians, whose skill as seamen was never matched by the ancient people before or after them. At all events, the Phœnicians were the first who spread the civilization of the East around the Mediterranean shores.

I.

They were called by the Greek name of *Phoinikes*,[7] which is probably only a change of the name Punt (Latin, Poeni, Punici), by which the Egyptians designated the populations of South Arabia and the Persian Gulf. Whence did the Phœnicians first come? Considering the great part which the Phœnicians played in the movements of ancient civilization, it is singular how fragmentary are our sources of knowledge for all the most essential elements of

[4] Isai. xxiii., 1; Jerem. xlvii; Ezek. xxvi., 27; Amos. i.; Zach. ix., 3. "All the trade-routes from the chief markets of the extreme east, India, Bactriana, Chaldæa, Arabia and the regions of Caucasus, which ran westwards, finally converged on Tyre and Sidon" (Maspéro, Hist. Ancienne, p. 235).

[5] McCurdy, *ibid.*, p. 73.

[6] Odes I., 3.

[7] According to Greek tradition, they were so called after Phœnix, son of Agenor, and founder of the race. Others said that Phoiniké simply meant "the red people," whether from living so long on the Persian Gulf (Mare Erythræum), or from the dye they manufactured, or from the dark complexion of the race. Others say that it simply means "the country of palm-trees" (from the Greek).

their history. Like the Egyptians, they claimed an antiquity of 30,000 years, yet they retained some memory of having migrated from older seats on an eastern sea. Herodotus[8] says that the original settlements of the Phœnicians were upon the Erythræan Sea (Persian Gulf), and that they migrated thence at a remote period and transferred their abode to the shores of the Mediterranean. "It was from the wilderness lands of North Arabia that the different families of the Semitic race,[9] proceeded to the scenes in which they enacted their various histories. The river land between the Tigris and Euphrates was the home of the great Semitic communities during by far the greatest part of the history of the civilized world."[10] At different periods there were migrations of Semites from Mesopotamia westwards, wave after wave, who occupied the fertile plains of Syria or the Mediterranean seaboard. Thus in 2097 B. C. the Kassi, who dwelt in the mountains of Elam, on the eastern frontier of Chaldæa (according to Professor Sayce), invaded Egypt, and for 511 years ruled there as the "Hyksos" (Shepherd) Kings.[11] Another and earlier wave of Semitic migration brought this people to the shores of Syria, beyond the Lebanon, where those flourishing merchant cities grew up whose influence upon the world's history was little proportioned to the restricted limits of their territory. We cannot say for certain when this happened. Phœnicia was certainly peopled in the reign of Sargon I. of Akkad (about 3800 B. C.), who ruled an empire extending from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean.

In historical times the Phœnicians called themselves Canaanites, and their land Canaan,[12] "the lowlands," the latter applying equally to the coast, which they themselves occupied, and the inland highlands, which the Israelites occupied. In the cuneiform documents they were included under the name of "Amurri," the Emorites, though in hieroglyphic records Palestine was known as Khar (or Khal) and northern Phœnicia as Zahi. The people themselves were called by the Egyptians Keftiu and sometimes Fenkhu.

II.

Phœnicia extended for 190 miles along the coast, from Arados, or Aroad, on the north to Akko (Acre) in the south, between latitude

[8] Herod. vii., 89.

[9] The Semitic race comprised the Assyrians, Babylonians, Aramæans, Arabians, Moabites, Phœnicians and Hebrews.

[10] "Recent Archæol. and Bible" (Nichol), p. 94.

[11] Egypt of the Hebrews (Sayce), p. 12; Prof. Flinders Petrie and Dr. T. Pinches agree in asserting their Semitic origin.

[12] Land of Canaan, "Kinakhi," is applied in the Tell-el-Amarna letters of the fourteenth century B. C. to N. Galilee and the Phœnician coast.

33.40 and 35.20 N. Movers[13] aptly sums up the character of this country: "Phœnicia was not a country; it was a series of ports with a very narrow hinterland." Two mountain ranges, the Lebanon and Anti-lebanon, run parallel to the coast, the former being the eastern boundary of Phœnicia.[14] Between them lies a large valley, watered throughout its length by the river Litani, which, flowing south, falls into the Mediterranean a little above Tyre, and by the Orontes, which flows north for sixty miles and finally rushes into the sea with great violence. Few provinces of the ancient world were as fertile as this deep valley. To the south there are fields of corn and vineyards, which carpet the floor of the valley and extend up the slopes of the mountain as far as the foot could reach. Northwards the deposits of the Orontes produced a black and fertile soil, rich in cereals and every kind of fruit. Hence Cœle-Syria, as the Greeks called it, after having in turn supported the Assyrian, Egyptian, Persian and Macedonian conquerors, who held sway over it, finally became under the Romans one of the granaries of the world. The country west of Lebanon is only a strip of land, the average width of which does not exceed 8 or 9 leagues. The left flank of Mount Lebanon is drained by small rivers, flowing swiftly into the sea.

The Phœnician towns, distant about ten or twelve leagues from one another, could only communicate safely with one another by sea. The northernmost town, Aradus, was built on a small island a mile and a half distant from the shore. On the mainland opposite stood Marath and Antarados. A second group of towns were situated near Gebel (the Greek Byblos), which claimed to be the oldest town in the world, having been built by the god El, near the river Adonis. So Gebel and the valley where its river flowed were "a sort of holy land of Adonis, full of temples and monuments consecrated to his cult."[15] Berouth shared with Gebel the glory of having been founded by El.

Some leagues south of Berouth stood Sidon, "first-born of Canaan."[16] The surrounding plain is watered by the "gracious Bostren" (Nahr-el-Aoualy) and laid out with gardens, whence the town received its name of "flowery Sidon." The territory under its sway lay between the rivers Tamour and Litani. South of the

[13] Die Phönizier, II., Pt. 2, pp. 1-4.

[14] The "Syria" of the Greeks included Phœnicia and Palestine, though originally they applied this name to all the country on the left of the Euphrates. The Arabs call the country Esh-Sham, or "the Left," for it is really the northern, or northwestern, end of the great Arabian peninsula, of which they call the southern side El-Yemen, or "the Right." Syria is derived from *Suri*.

[15] Rénan, "Mission de Phènice."

[16] Gen. x.

Litani, up to Carmel, was the domain of Tyre. Long ages ago (according to Phœnician legends) "the god Samemroum traced on the mainland the plan of a town with dew, opposite which his brother, Hysôos, the first sailor, occupied some islets, where he erected sacred pillars. This was the beginning of Tyre."[17]

Both the maritime district, partly under artificial irrigation, and the terraces laid out with great care on the mountain sides were in antiquity in a high state of cultivation, and the country—more especially that portion which lies north of the Litani along the flanks of the Lebanon—still presents some of the richest and most beautiful landscapes in the world, in this respect far excelling the Italian Riviera. With justice Lebanon was often praised by Hebrew writers. Now known as the Jebel-esh-Sheikh (the white-headed old man), or Jebel-el-Tilf (mountain of ice), it was to Phœnicia at once its protection, the source of its greatness and its crowning beauty. It extended "for a hundred miles with an average elevation of from 6,000 to 8,000 feet, but its frowning precipices and its lofty crest deterred or baffled the invader.[18] . . . This western region it was which held those inexhaustible stores of forest trees that supplied Phœnicia with her warships and her vast commercial navy."[19]

For the most part the Lebanon approaches within not many miles of the coast, or even close to it, leaving only a narrow belt of lowland, which from remote antiquity has been traversed by a caravan route. The Phœnicians, thus confined to a territory insufficient to support their population, found themselves compelled by an imperious necessity to seek on the high seas a new country, as it were, and a means of livelihood. Most of the people who then lived along the shores of the Mediterranean were still uncivilized, in that primitive state known as the "Neolithic period," and only used canoes and rafts for fishing. Mr. George Smith says: "Practically early Syria's only opening lay seawards. If she had anything to pour forth of her own or of what she had borrowed from the civilizations on either side of her, this must be the direction of outflow. So some of her tribes, whose race had hitherto been known only as land traders, voyagers of the desert, pushed out from her coasts upon the sea. They found it as studded with islands as the desert is studded with oases, and by means of these they gradually reached the very west of Europe. The first of these islands (Cyprus) is within sight of Syria. . . . Along those islands and coasts the

---

[17] Movers, I., p. 258; II., 1, pp. 131, 501.

[18] We will speak of the Assyrian invasions later. Maspéro, however, says that it was from the beginning infested by brigands, *e. g.*, the Shasou, or roving Arabs, in the time of Rameses II.

[19] Rawlinson, "Phœnicia," p. 14.

line of Phœnician voyages can be traced by the deposit of Semitic names, inscriptions and legends. It is not surprising that the early Greek civilization, which they did so much to form, should have given the Phœnicians the fame of inventors. But they were not much more than carriers."[20]

To the natural advantages of Phœnicia above mentioned must be added the possession of good natural harbors. "Nature has so far assisted man by prompting here a cape and dropping there an islet, that not a few harbors have been formed which have been, and may again become, historical. When we remember that the ships of antiquity were small, propelled by oars and easily beached, we understand how these few advantages were sufficient to bring forth the greatest maritime nation of the ancient world."[21] South of Carmel the Syrian coast has no natural harbors; this fact explains why Carmel was the southern limit of Phœnician territory, and from thence to Egypt the tribes were mainly agricultural.

By knowing the geographical conditions of their country we can better understand the character of the Phœnicians, as compared with that of their other Semitic kinsmen. Physically they seem to have resembled the Assyrians and Jews, the latter being a younger branch of the Semitic family. "The Jews owned the same blood and speech as the Phœnicians. . . . The language of the Phœnicians was closely related to that of the Hebrews, as German to Dutch, or Portuguese to Spanish."[22] But whereas the Jews of later times were cautious and circumscribed in their dealings, the Phœnicians displayed remarkable audacity in enterprise. They seem not to have excelled in originality, like the Egyptians, Assyrians and Greeks, so much as in the power of adapting and improving upon the inventions of others. Thus Herodotus, who admires the learning of the Persians, the science of the Babylonians and the combined learning and science of the Egyptians, limits his commendation of the Phœnicians to their skill in navigation, in mechanics and in works of art.[23] They owed their idea of alphabetic writing to another people, their weights and measures to Babylon, their shipbuilding probably to Egypt, their early architecture and pottery to Assyria, Egypt and early Greece. The adaptability of the Phœnicians was especially shown in their power of ingratiating themselves in the favor of the peoples with whom they came in contact. Thus, they settled in Memphis, in Egypt;[24] Tyre had friendly

[20] "Hist. Geogr. of Holy Land," chapt. I.

[21] "Hist. Geogr. of Holy Land," chapt. I.

[22] Rawlinson, "Phœnicia."

[23] Herod. I., 1; II., 4, 99, 142; III., 129; Strabo, 16, p. 1,076, etc.

[24] Herodotus (II., 112) mentions the Tyrian settlement and shrine of Astarté at Memphis.

relations with Palestine, Babylonia, Assyria and Greece, and we read of the continued alliance between the Phœnicians and Israelites.[25] When Egypt or Assyria fought against the peoples of Chanaan the Phœnicians conciliated them by costly gifts and tribute.

As all extant accounts of this people were written by their enemies, it is not easy to test the truth of any statements as to their commercial honesty. Among the Romans "perfidia Punica" was a synonym for the basest treachery,[26] while among the Greeks "Phœnician deceit" had passed into a proverb. Was this unenviable reputation simply due to the jealousy of unsuccessful rivals? The connection of trading and dishonesty is not indeed a novelty; nor was it an accident that the word *kapelos* in Greek meant both retail dealer and rogue. Thus in a fragment of Sophocles occurs the phrase:

"He's a Phœnician, a Sidonian huckster!"

Facts seem to show that in their commercial dealings, at least, their standard of honesty varied with their customers. With civilized nations like Babylonia they were of necessity scrupulously honest, but with untutored natives like the Spaniards there was no limit to their cruelty and extortion.[27]

Perhaps the Phœnicians in some way repaid such ill-gotten gains by the knowledge they spread of Eastern civilization. The profound influence of Phœnicia on Greece is shown in many ways—in the names of the letters, of many vegetables, metals and wares, and most, though not all, of the religion she conveyed. The exact debt of Greek religion to Phœnicia will never be known, but the more we learn of both races the more we see how great it was. Myths, rites, morals, all spread westwards and formed some of the earliest constituents of Greek civilization.

III.

The origin and progress of the colonization which changed the Mediterranean into a Phœnician sea are only imperfectly known to us. Phœnician documents relating to this have perished utterly, as well as the works which the writers of the Græco-Roman period composed with their help. Till recently most of our knowledge was gathered from the myths and traditions of the Greeks. The

[25] III. Kings xi., 1; xvi., 31; Ezra iii., 7; Isaias xxiii,, 15-18.

[26] Cf. Livy xxi., 4. "In eo . . . perfidia plus quam Punica"—a trait of Hannibal. In xlii., 49, he compares Roman straightforwardness with the "versutiæ Poenorum . . . apud quos fallere hostem, quam vi superare, gloriosius fuit."

[27] Cf. Hdt. i., 1, and Hom. Odyssey, xiv., xv. Thucydides (i., 8) describes them as simply pirates; but perhaps he could not distinguish between lawful and unlawful gain.

priests of the god Melgarth (the Tyrian Hercules) told Herodotus that "the temple had been built at the same time as Tyre itself;[28] now they had dwelt there for 2,300 years." This calculation brings us to the year 2700 B. C., a period which synchronizes with the twelfth Egyptian dynasty.

But the monuments of the two oldest civilizations of the world, Babylonia and Egypt,[29] indicate the probability of an earlier date for the beginnings of Phœnician activity, for they reveal the existence of a widespread commerce by land and sea many centuries before this date. The use of bronze[30] (copper with an alloy of tin) in early times shows that commerce was already very extensive, for the nearest place whence tin could be obtained was the Caucasus, and that only with great peril and difficulty. But who were the pioneers of navigation in the Mediterranean?

In the earliest ages of Egyptian history commerce was carried on by sea. Tombs and vases of the pre-dynastic period have been discovered (dating from 6000 B. C.), whereon large ships, sometimes with as many as sixty oars, are depicted, that traded with the "Haûi-nibû," the people beyond the seas, who dwelt in the islands of the "Uaz-ûr" (Mediterranean) and brought foreign pottery and gold to Egypt.[31] Cedar wood must have been always imported into Egypt, even in the age of the Pyramids (4000 B. C.). "Beads of amber are still found near Abydos in the tombs of the oldest necropolis (3500 B. C.), and we may well ask how many hands they had passed through before reaching the banks of the Nile from the shores of the Baltic. Some, at all events, of the wood required for building . . . such as pine, cypress or cedar, was brought from the forests of Lebanon or those of Amanus."[32] Whether these wares were first imported by the Egyptians themselves or through the Phœnicians cannot be decided from the available evidence. Dr. A. Evans says: "Maritime enterprise did not begin on the harborless coasts of Palestine. The island-world of the Ægean was the natural home of primitive navigation." (*Times*, September 18, 1896.) The opinion of Professor Petrie seems most probable, who

[28] Sidon was the chief town of Phœnicia till its destruction, about 1200 B. C. Hence Herodotus (viii., 67) ranks it before Tyre, and Isaias (xxiii., 12) calls Tyre "daughter of Sidon," because peopled by Sidonian refugees.

[29] Prof. Hilprecht (Babylonian Expedition of Penns. Univ., I., pt. 2, p. 24) dates the beginnings of Babylonian civilization between 6000 and 7000 B. C. Likewise, Sayce dates the founding of Eridu from 6000 B. C., while Prof. Flinders Petrie fixes the dawn of Egyptian civilization (his o-Dynasty period) at about 7000 B. C.

[30] In Egypt called tehset and xomt. Assyr. nuksu, Hebr. nekoset.

[31] Encyl. Brit. (1902), art. "Egyptology."

[32] Maspéro, "Dawn of Civilization" (1901), p. 392. "The Egyptians used bronze from the Fourth Dynasty downwards (B. C. 4000), side by side with pure copper."

concludes thus: "The most likely thing is that the Mediterranean people always were familiar with shipping, and whichever civilized soonest—probably Libyans—started the commercial traffic." We have no proof, he adds, as to who manned the prehistoric ships mentioned above, or when the Phœnicians first engaged in this commerce. The earliest mention of a voyage from the Phœnician coast occurs in the Babylonian tablets, when Sargon I., about 3800 B. C., crossed to the "land in the midst of the sea of the setting sun," *i. e.*, Cyprus—probably in Phœnician ships.[33] Probably, therefore, as Professor McCurdy says, Phœnician commercial activity began about 4000 years B. C., and previous to that time whatever commerce had been carried on in the eastern Mediterranean had been in the hands of the Libyans, Tahonou.

The earliest reference in the Bible to them occurs in the blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix.), "Zebulon shall dwell at the haven of the sea, and he shall sojourn in ships; and his border shall be unto Sidon." The date of this is about 1850 B. C.

Egyptian monuments first mention them in the time of the eighteenth dynasty. Aahmes, founder of this dynasty, conquered Syria as far as Zahi about 1600 B. C. By this time Phœnician trade must have been very greatly developed, and the common use of bronze (containing ten per cent. of tin) proves that the Phœnician seafarers had already gone very far afield.[34] Tahutmes III., who reigned in Egypt from 1503 to 1449 B. C., was master of all Phœnicia, and in the lists of places conquered by him and engraved on the walls of the temple at Karnak occur Onedeshu (Kadesh on the Orontes), Demesqu (Damascus), Japu (Joppa), Oarman (Carmel). Among the people depicted bringing tribute to him are "the princes of the land of Keftu (Phœnicia) and of the islands in the great sea." The Sidonians prudently submitted to him and propitiated him with gifts rather than imperil their vast commerce by a useless resistance. The copious "Annals of Tahutmes III." will give some idea of the great wealth of the Phœnicians at this time;[35] and though history is silent about them from the time of Sargon I., King of Babylon,

[33] Cuneiform Inscript. of W. Asia, IV., 34, 24-26. The Lybians (Tahonou, as the Egyptians called them), comprising the Lebu and other tribes, dwelt in North Africa, and, with the islanders of the Mediterranean, were called the Tamehu, or the fair race, to distinguish them from the Egyptians, 'Aamu (Semites) and Negroes. These four races of mankind are depicted in the Tombs of the Kings.

[34] It is impossible in a small space to explain fully the proof of the antiquity of commerce from the use of bronze. The amount of tin used for it increased with the development of commerce. Probably from its Sanskrit name, kastîra, tin was brought at a very early period from Malay to India and Babylonia by Arab traders, who called it "kasdeer."

[35] Cf. Flinders Petrie, "History of Egypt," II., pp. 103-125. Also his "Syria and Egypt."

to that of the patriarch, Jacob—a space of about 2,000 years—the numerous works of art mentioned in these Annals show the high degree of civilization which they had attained.

The Tell-el-Amarna tablets give us a picture of Canaan in the century which preceded the exodus of the Israelites out of Egypt and testify to the enormous wealth of Phœnicia at this time, when it was under the protection of Egypt. Professor Sayce says: "When Khu-n-aten was Pharaoh (about 1380 B. C.) the cities of Canaan were numerous and wealthy. The people were highly cultured and excelled especially as workers in gold and silver, as manufacturers of porcelain and vari-colored glass and as weavers of richly-dyed linen. Their merchants already traded to distant parts of the known world."[36] According to Petrie, "the civilization of Syria at this time was equal, if not superior, to that of Egypt."

It was during this period of Egyptian suzerainty that Sidon reached the zenith of her prosperity. Cyprus (Khittim) had been the first island they had colonized, probably when Sidon was founded. Thence coasting along Asia Minor they came to Rhodes and Crete, which formed the gateway of the Grecian archipelago. There the purple fisheries attracted the Phœnicians to Itanos; Lappa and Knôsos in the north, Arad, Gortyna and Lebene in the south were occupied or founded.[37] Cythera at the entrance of the Gulf of Laconia, scarcely three miles from the mainland, was a port of call for their vessels bound for Italy or Sicily. The "murex," or shell fish, whence they obtained "the purple of the islands" (Ezek. xxvii., 7) was so abundant there that at one time Cythera was termed "the purple isle." The Phœnicians formed a settlement there and built a shrine to Astarté, the first perhaps ever erected in Greece.[38] There are traces of Phœnician occupation at Antiparos, Ios and Syros, in the south Ægean. They opened the rich silver mines of the isles of Siphnos and Cimolos. Further north the isle of Thasos, opposite Thrace, served as a depôt for the gold mines of Mount Pangaeus on the mainland; and the traces of them ten centuries later excited the wonder of Herodotus.[39]

Passing through the Hellespont and Bosphorus, they dared in their frail barks to brave the storms of the Euxine (Black Sea), and freighted their ships with the produce of the coast regions, finally coming to Colchis, whence they brought the precious metals, which Greek legend symbolized in the myth of the Argonauts and the Golden Fleece—gold from Colchian rivers and the Arimaspian coun-

[36] "Egypt of the Hebrews," p. 69.
[37] Movers, Die Phönizier, II., pt. 2, pp. 258-261.
[38] Hdt. I., 105; Pausanias I., 15, 5; III., 23, 1.
[39] Hdt. VI., 47.

try, tin from Caucasus,[40] silver and lead and iron from the Chalybes, which they also brought overland across Armenia, besides tunnies and sardines from the coast fisheries.

At the same time Sidonian merchants also visited the coast of Epirus and Southern Italy. Melos, opposite Laconia, produced sulphur, alum and "Melian earth." There were murex fisheries at Nisyra and Gyaros. All these island depôts were less easy to attack and more capable of defense than stations on the mainland of Greece or Asia. Yet there are traces of their settlements in Greece itself, at Ægina, Salamis, Argolis, Attica and the Isthmus of Corinth. None of these survived the "Dorian invasion," but their presence amid the pre-Homeric peoples of Greece had a lasting influence on Hellenic religion. Traces of their stay appear in the tombs of Mycenae, where Phœnician idols, amber beads and ostrich eggs were found side by side with gold ornaments of "Mycenæan" style. Thus, too, the rock tombs of Hymettus closely resemble those of Phœnicia, and we find, at Corinth, the worship of the Tyrian Melgarth under the name of Melicertes.

But the Sidonians could not enjoy the monopoly of Mediterranean commerce forever. Egyptian monuments of the time of Seti I. (about 1327 B. C.) record the confederation of "Pelasgian" nations, who formed a great fleet to invade Egypt. Among these nations are mentioned the "Pelasgae"[41] and the Lebu (Libyans) of North Africa. They were repulsed from Egypt, but settled in the Ægean Isles and seriously harassed Phœnician commerce. The Sidonian settlements in the Ægean fell one after another, except Thasos in the north, Melos and Thera in the Cyclades, Cythera and Rhodes. The Homeric poems, which treat of this period, show the Phœnicians passed from the condition of masters of the sea to that of simple merchants. Hence they were compelled to seek new markets in the west—in North Africa, Malta and Sicily, where they already had colonies at Ziz (Panormus), Motya, Kepher (Solonté), Rosh Melgarth and Eryx. From Sicily two routes lay before them—going north they came to Sardinia, with its silver mines, and the Balearic Isles; or coasting along North Africa, they came to the Straits of Gibraltar. The Balearic Isles served as a depôt for the products of Spain, the modern Port Mahon being one of the best ports in the Mediterranean. This shifting of the seat of their commerce is referred to by M. Arnold:

> As some grave Tyrian trader from the sea
> Descried at sunrise an emerging prow . . .

[40] Movers, II., pt. 2, pp. 297-308.

[41] The "Pelasgæ" were one of the chief races inhabiting Greece in pre-Homeric times. All the maritime enemies of Egypt belonged to the Tamehu, or "white race" (Aryans).

Among the Ægean isles;
And saw the merry Grecian coaster come . . .
And knew the intruders on his ancient home,
The young, light-hearted masters of the waves;
And snatched his rudder and shook out more sail,
And day and night held on indignantly
O'er the blue midland waters with the gale,
Betwixt the Syrtes and soft Sicily,
To where the Atlantic raves
Outside the Western Straits, and unbent sails . . .
And on the beach undid his corded bales.[42]

This great maritime migration was one epoch in what is known as the "Mycenæan civilization," which prevailed in Greece and the Ægean Isles from about the seventeenth to the twelfth century before Christ. "Mycenæan civilization" is a convenient epithet for a certain phase of a prehistoric civilization which as a whole is often called "Ægean." Some common influence spread at a certain period over the whole Ægean area and reduced almost to identity a number of local civilizations of similar origin but diverse development. Argos, Mycenæ, Attica, Thebes, etc., in Greece, and the Ægean Isles have been proved by the excavations of Dr. A. Evans and others in recent years to be prolific in the remains of this prehistoric period out of all proportion to the remains of classical Hellenic culture, which latter it preceded by a long interval of time. The discovery of "Mycenæan" tombs, vases, weapons, etc., reveal the different stages of this civilization, which till the researches of Dr. Schliemann in 1876 at Hissarlik (Troy) and Mycenæ was conveniently known as the "Heroic Age" of Greece, and about which so many "legends" had been written by Greek writers. The closing period of this prehistoric civilization is depicted for us in the poems of Homer—Agamemnon, King of Mycenæ, "rules over Argive land and many isles" (Il. ii., 108), the "Argive land" being Peloponnesus —and it was finally eclipsed by the descent of northern tribes into Greece about 1100 B. C., remembered by the Greeks as the "Dorian invasion." The question as to who were the authors of this "Mycenæan civilization" has not yet been answered. The claims of Pelasgians, Carians, Achæans, Danaans, etc., have been successively proposed, but so far no conclusion has been generally accepted.

[42] From "the Scholar Gypsy." This change is preserved for us in the Phœnician legend of Melgarth voyaging round the Mediterranean and conquering Spain. On this tradition, which sums up roughly the main features of Phœnician colonization, many local traditions were engrafted, *e. g.*, those of Kinyras, Europa, Cadmus visiting Cyprus, Rhodes, etc., the labors of Hercules, the brazen Talos in Crete, the eight children of Helios in Rhodes, etc. It is partly owing to these legends that we can conjecture the lost history of their discoveries, and also of the "Mycenæan" peoples, who occupied Greece in prehistoric times. As Bacon long ago pointed out, "the writings that relate these fables being not delivered as inventions of the writers, but as things before believed and received, appear like a soft whisper from the traditions of more ancient nations, conveyed through the flutes of the Grecians."

Mr. Hogarth says: "We can hardly question that the early peoples, whom the Greeks knew as Pelasgi, Leleges, Dania, Carians, and so forth, shared in it. But were they its authors? And who, after all, were they themselves? The Greeks believed them their own kin, but what value can we attach to the belief of an age to which scientific ethnology and archæology were unknown? . . . The fabric and decoration of the tombs discovered in Crete, Cyprus, Mycenæ, etc., is not that of any well-known art, Egyptian, Assyrian and Babylonian."[43] And again: "We know at least what Ægean civilization was not. It was *not* the disguised product of any of the Eastern peoples with which we have been long acquainted, least of all of the Phœnician Semites."

One result of these discoveries has been to restore faith in the authority of the Greek writers who treat of prehistoric times, and to prove that about these times Herodotus, Thucydides, Pausanias, etc., wrote substantial truth. Thus Thucydides (i., 4) tells us how the Phœnicians were driven from the Ægean by Minos, King of Crete, who became master of the Cyclades and the Hellenic sea and put down piracy on the seas. He lived in the best period of prehistoric Cretan civilization (fourteenth and fifteenth centuries B. C.).[44]

It is impossible at present to say what influence the Phœnicians had on this "Mycenæan" civilization. They only established depôts on the Ægean coasts, which served as ports of call for their vessels, while the islands themselves were occupied by the peoples, to whom the "Mycenæan" art is due. Mr. Hogarth says: "As for the Phœnicians, for whom on the strength of the Homeric tradition a strong plea has been put forward, it cannot be said to be impossible that some objects, thought to be Mycenæan, are of Sidonian origin. The only scripts known to have been used in the Mycenæan area and period are in no way affiliated to the Phœnician alphabet, and neither the characteristic forms nor the characteristic style of Phœnician art, as we know it, appear in Mycenæan products."

The mention here of the Phœnician alphabet leads us to inquire as to its origin. We know that the Greeks of historical times received their alphabet from the Phœnicians, which unanimous tradition connects with the name of Cadmus, the mythic founder of Thebes. Till recently de Rougé's opinion was generally admitted that the Phœnician letters were derived from the Hieratic writing of the Egyptians, which the Phœnicians communicated to the Greeks. But recent excavations seem to favor Professor Petrie's

[43] Cf. Encyl. Brit. (XXXI.), on "Mycenæan Civilization."

[44] Cf. Hdt. II., 122. The splendid palace and tombs at Knôsos, recently discovered by Dr. A. Evans, confirm the testimony of Thucydides.

view of its origin—that out of a large body of symbols in use from prehistoric times around the shores of the Mediterranean the Phœnicians specialized as alphabetic signs those which they had utilized as numerals, and that this specialization was the starting point of the alphabet as we know it. The use as numerals "would soon render these signs as invariable in order as our own numerals and force the use of them on all countries with which the Phœnicians traded. Hence, before long these signs drove out of use all others, except in the less changed civilization of Asia Minor and Spain. This exactly explains the phenomena of the early Greek alphabets, many in variety . . . yet entirely uniform in order."[45]

Perhaps when scholars have deciphered the Mycenæan scripts lately discovered we may learn what share the Phœnicians had in that civilization, with which they must have been long acquainted. By 1150 B. C., when Rameses III. was Pharaoh, the power of Egypt was waning and she was forced to withdraw her garrisons from Syria, thus leaving the Phœnician cities entirely unprotected. A Philistine fleet, setting out from Ascalon, defeated the Phœnician squadron, and then attacked Sidon, which they almost entirely destroyed. The Sidonians fled to Tyre, which thenceforward became the chief town of the Phœnicians.

But their commerce with the west still flourished. In Spain, beyond the Straits of Gibraltar, was the country of Tartessus, one of the most productive regions of the ancient world. Their oldest colonies seem to have been Sax (Motril) and Onoba. About 1100 a Tyrian squadron planted a colony at Gadir (now Cadiz), which from its splendid position soon became the centre of Phœnician settlements in Spain, Carteia (Algesiras), Malaca (Malaga), Abdera (Almeria). The untutored natives of Spain had little idea of the value of the metals; for long there was no competition, and so the profits were enormous. It was said that even the anchors were of silver in ships returning from Spain. Amber, too, was brought in very early times from the Baltic regions. Amber ornaments are often mentioned by Homer, and have been found in the oldest tombs of Cumae and in those by the Lions' gate at Mycenæ. The Phœnicians took measures to prevent other merchants having access to the regions with which they carried on their most lucrative business. Their deliberate efforts to keep secret the source of their supplies of amber and frankincense help to account for the geographical ignorance displayed in earlier Greek writers (*e. g.*, Herodotus iii., 115). The gruesome tales of the Laestrygones and Cyclopes and Symple-

[45] "Royal Tombs," I., p. 32. The oldest Greek inscriptions (of the seventh century B. C.) were found in the isle of Thera by Gärtringen in 1896.

gades—as well as those of Circe, Scylla and Charybdis—were not improbably largely invented to deter the Greeks from sailing into the Black Sea or the western Mediterranean. The Greeks of later generations were apt to call these fables "Phœnician lies."

But we have already exceeded the limits of a single article. As Vergil says:

> Immensum spatüs confecimus æquor;
> Et jam tempus eqûm fumantia solvere colla.

In another article we hope to continue this account of Phœnician commerce till it received its deathblow in the fall of Tyre, 332 years before the Christian era.

J. D. Murphy, S. J.

St. Bueno's College, North Wales.

SOME REMARKS ON BISHOP DOANE'S ARTICLE IN THE "NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW" FOR APRIL, 1905.

BISHOP DOANE, the Episcopal Bishop of Albany, has written an article for the April number of the *North American Review* on "Remarriage after Divorce: The Practice of the Roman Church Contrasted with Its Theory." The writer's high standing among his co-religionists will at once attract attention, and his words are likely to have weight with those of his creed. Many will read his article out of curiosity or with the hope of finding therein new strength in their desire to put down divorce. But Catholics will rise from its perusal with the conviction that outside of the Catholic Church we look in vain for a remedy against the great evil that is desolating our land and polluting the fountains of human life. In the article the Catholic will also see the incredible anomaly of an apparently sincere man who, having Catholic authors like Gury and Thein before him, is utterly senseless to the meaning of Catholic teaching and boldly states without fear of contradiction what is sheer falsehood.

The reason why the Catholic Church is different to all others is because she alone is the Church of Christ; she alone the dispenser of the sacraments, and hence she alone has the right to determine the hindrances to marriage. For Christian marriage is a sacrament. The contract is the marriage. Hence the contract is the sacrament. Now it is the Church's power, and hers alone, to judge cases that touch the validity of the sacraments; hence hers alone to judge of cases that touch the contract of matrimony, which is a sacrament.

Moreover, civil society can, by demanding certain formalities, invalidate natural contracts entered into without them. *A fortiori* then can the Church determine and define when this contract, which Christ Himself committed to her care, is valid. "He therefore," says Leo XIII. in his great encyclical on Christian marriage, "having renewed marriages to such and so great excellence, commended and entrusted all the discipline bearing upon them to His Church. And the Church has exercised this power over Christian marriage in every clime and every age; she has so used it as to show that it was her own, not granted by man, but from on high by her Founder's will. And she has walled this institution round about by such power and the provident enactment of such divine laws that no one can be a fair judge without seeing that in this point of marriage the best guardian and protector of the human race is the Church, whose wisdom has triumphed over time's flight and man's injustice and the countless vicissitudes of public events. We must confess, then, that ever intent on protecting the sanctity and perpetuity of marriage, the Catholic Church has merited well of the nations of the world."

After making a series of statements about the last General Convention of his Church and forecasting the future opinions of many Episcopalians on the question of divorce, the Bishop begins his attack on the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church. "That Church," he says, "is in a perfectly different position towards this whole subject from any other religious body in the world because she claims two things: the power to annul a marriage or rather to declare it void *ab initio*, and secondly to dispense with certain hindrances to marriage." We have given above the real reason why the Church is different from all other religious bodies. It is simply because she alone is the Church of Christ; to her alone was given the guardianship of the matrimonial contract between Christians which is a sacrament, and she has exercised this power from immemorial ages. But apart from this the Bishop's statement is misleading. First, the Church does not claim the power to annul every marriage; she has no power to annul a Christian marriage that has been consummated, or the marriage of infidels as long as both parties remain in infidelity.* Secondly, to annul a marriage is entirely different from declaring it void *ab initio*. In the one case the marriage existed, in the other it did not exist. Again, the Bishop will excuse us for remarking that we always thought a human legislator could dispense in his own laws. Why then cannot the legislating Catholic Church dispense in certain purely ecclesi-

* For the dissolution of matrimonium ratum et non consummatum. For the Pauline Privilege, see Gury.

astical laws in particular cases for just reason? Cannot the State create an impediment to a certain contract and afterwards for cogent reasons dispense in individual instances? Is this against the nature of law or in accordance with it? "Stated in practical terms," says Bishop Doane, "the Roman Catholic Church both creates and does away with impediments to marriage." Does the Bishop mean to say that at one and the same time she does both? Surely not! For then there would be no impediments at all. Or does he mean that the Church makes a law which is binding on all the faithful and then when a particular case arises for sufficient cause relaxes the obligation in a given case? And if he thinks that this is an insurmountable difficulty, then we can only say that the good man is poorly read in first principles. When a legislator exempts an individual does he do away with his law as regards the rest of the community? "I am a bit anxious," he adds, "to make myself clear in regard to this matter." We wish he had before he wrote. However, he is very sincere. "I confess to a feeling of more or less uncertainty about my position." As well he might. In one point we confess to a feeling of certainty, namely, that the Bishop is woefully in the wrong as regards our position. The reason the Bishop feels uncertain is because on the one hand he was accused of holding the Roman or rigorist theory, while on the other some Catholics questioned the accuracy of a statement which he made in the address to his own convention that the Roman Church refused divorce, but multiplied possibilities of remarriage by innumerable grounds of dispensation and countless definitions of prenuptial sins. It would be more accurate to say prenuptial impediments. And these Catholics were only defending their own side from a calumny, for Rome has not multiplied possibilities of remarriage by innumerable grounds of dispensation and countless definitions of prenuptial sins. The Bishop does not evidently know anything about the practice of Rome in conceding dispensations. He does not seem to know that a canonical cause which would be sufficient for one would be wholly inadequate for another. He does not reflect that Rome has guarded her right in this matter with the most stringent methods of procedure; that she is ever alive to the slightest danger of laxity and takes cognizance of the danger at once. Briefly, in practice as well as in theory, she guards the sacredness of the marriage tie, even against the assaults of the most exalted rulers of the earth, as no other power can, and has thus won for herself the well-earned fame of being the greatest benefactor of the human race, as Leo XIII. tells us: "As often, indeed, as the Supreme Pontiffs have resisted the most powerful among rulers in their threatening demands that divorces carried out by them should be confirmed by the Church,

so often must we account them to have been contending for the safety, not only of religion, but also of the human race. For this reason all generations of men will admire the proofs of unbending courage which are to be found in the decrees of Nicholas I. against Lothair; of Urban II. and Paschal II. against Philip I. of France; of Clement VII. and Paul III. against Henry VIII., and lastly of Pius VII., that holy and courageous Pontiff, against Napoleon I., when at the height of his prosperity and in the fulness of his power." (Encyclical on Marriage.) And notwithstanding these facts, the fair-minded Bishop rehearses the stories of Louis XII. of France, of Napoleon and even of old Henry VIII.

The Bishop has been in training for this attack on Rome, for he tells us: "I have carefully gone through 'The History of the Council of Trent,' by Pietro Polano, translated by Nathaniel Brent, published in London in 1620, and also 'The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent' in Le Plat's edition, published in Antwerp in 1779. I have also carefully read Gury's 'Compendium of Moral Theology' and a book which is called 'The Ecclesiastical Dictionary,' by the Rev. John Thein, which has the imprimatur of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of New York and the Roman Catholic Archbishop *(sic)* of Cleveland. So that I have done what in me lies to get accurate and authoritative information." Has he? Does he not know that the "Historia del Concilio Tridentino," published in London by Pietro Polano, is the work of that arch-enemy of Rome, Parpi; that the London publication was due to the apostate, de Dominis, and that the work was put on the Index because of historical and theological errors contained in it? Is this the way to get accurate information?

"I confess myself confused," he continues, "and convinced of the fact that when in controversy a defender of the Roman system is cornered by one difficulty he can escape through some other opening." Strange cornering that! And what kind of an arguer is he who can corner an opponent and yet cannot keep him in the corner until he cries enough? Now the Bishop enumerates several Tridentine anathemas and closes his account by informing the reader that "it seems pretty difficult to escape from being anathematized under one or other of these various heads." Not very difficult! Faith and the grace of God will suffice to keep one free from all of them. There are millions of Catholics who have never fallen under a single anathema. Then follow some quotations from Father Thein's work.

After making several animadversions on the difficulties Catholics labor under of defending themselves and on a few modern instances, the Bishop comes to a point with which we are much more seriously concerned than any other for the present. Catholics hold that

marriages of baptized persons are sacraments; that one may receive a sacrament without receiving the grace of the sacrament. For instance, an adult who receives baptism without sorrow of heart for his past mortal sins is really baptized, but commits a sacrilege and does not receive the grace of baptism. Catholics hold that baptized heretics receive the sacrament of marriage when they enter the married contract, but that neither Catholics nor heretics receive the grace of this sacrament if they are in the state of mortal sin. To receive the sacrament and the grace of the sacrament are two distinct things; the one, grace, being the effect of the other, the sacrament, is given only to those who do not place a hindrance to this effect. The Bishop says: "I have carefully read Gury's 'Compendium of Moral Theology.'" Now in number 191 in his treatise on the "sacraments in general" Gury teaches that they are divided into *formata* vel *informia* according as they produce grace when they are received, or, on account of some obstacle [obex], suspend their effect until the hindrance be removed. In chapter fourth [nn. 228, 229, 230] he teaches what is necessary for the valid, and in the second article of the same chapter [n. 231] what is necessary for the licit reception of the sacraments. Treating of the minister of baptism [n. 243], he lays down the principle: "Every human being having the use of reason, man or woman, Catholic or heretic, faithful or infidel, is the extraordinary minister of baptism, so that such a one can *always* baptize validly, and, *in the case of necessity*, licitly." Moreover [n. 248, Q. 5], he says that it is of faith according to the Council of Trent that baptism conferred by a heretic with all the requisites for this sacrament is valid. The subject of the Sacrament of Matrimony [n. 772] is every baptized person who is not bound by an impediment of the natural, divine or canon law, so that heretics and schismatics validly contract marriage and receive the sacrament. And this is confirmed by the practice of the Church, which does not oblige them to renew their consent when they become converts to the Church. According, then, to the Catholic Church marriage is a sacrament which is received validly even by baptized heretics; the sacrament may be validly received without the effect of sanctifying grace. This grace is conferred on all baptized persons who receive the sacrament with souls free from the stain of mortal sin. This being the case, what wonder is it that we were amazed when we read the following sentence: "According to the Roman Church, marriage being a sacrament, and no one being able to receive the grace of the sacrament unless he is a Catholic Christian, it follows that the marriages of persons who are not Roman Catholics are not sacramental and have no sacramental grace or sanctity connected with them." This proposition is

founded on dense ignorance of the teachings of the Church, of the nature of sacraments, of the contents of the very book, Gury, which the Bishop informs us he has carefully read, but which having read he does not understand.

We doubt if it be possible for a sincere man to make more mistakes in a given sentence than did Bishop Doane in the words I have just quoted. But error generates error, and the Bishop is now in full race along his devious path. The Church of God teaches that every valid matrimonial contract between baptized persons is a sacrament; that the one falls with the other. You cannot have a valid contract which is not a sacrament; you cannot have the sacrament which is not a valid contract, whether the contracting persons be Roman Catholics or Episcopalians or what not, if they only be baptized. Marriages, then, of baptized persons who are not Roman Catholics are not "merely legal contracts;" they are a divine institution, elevated by Christ to an altogether supernatural, sacramental dignity. But the Bishop says: "They are simply legal contracts which the law creates and which the same law can dissolve." Whereas the truth is, the law did not create them and cannot dissolve them. Liken further to the good Bishop: "Some Roman theologians hold that if both parties are baptized their marriage is Christian marriage, though they have no grace of the sacraments, unless they are Roman Catholics; but the modern Roman fashion is to rebaptize all converts to Romanism, and so to invalidate all baptism but Roman baptism. So that even when both parties are baptized persons, unless they are Roman Catholics the marriage is merely a legal contract." The Bishop had said that "according to the Roman Church marriage being a sacrament and no one being able to receive the grace of a sacrament unless he is a Catholic Christian, it follows that the marriages of persons who are not Roman Catholics are not sacraments," and now he tells us that "some Roman theologians hold that if both persons are baptized their marriage is Christian marriage, though they have no grace of the sacrament, unless they are Roman Catholics." Now how the Bishop can say that the Roman Church teaches one thing and that some Catholic theologians maintain the contradictory, remaining the while Roman, is a puzzle to the present writer. But the difficulty is not with the Roman Church or her theologians, but with the good Bishop, who is romanticizing and evolving his own spectacular theories as to Roman doctrine from erroneous notions of the Catholic teaching on the sacraments. He is altogether wrong in the first sentence; he is altogether wrong in the second sentence of this paragraph. What wonder is it that he misstates the fact in the first part of the third sentence, for all Roman theologians hold

that marriages contracted by baptized persons who are not bound by diriment impediments are sacraments whether they be Catholics or heretics, and that the sacrament may be received by the same without the effect of grace. The Bishop goes on: "But the modern Roman fashion is to rebaptize all converts to Romanism, and so to invalidate all baptism but Roman baptism." We had an idea that there was but *one* baptism; that it was of faith that baptism conferred by a heretic with all the essential requisites was a valid baptism; that nothing on earth could invalidate it. Baptism is necessary for salvation, and hence whenever there is a reasonable doubt as to the validity of the former baptism the sacrament is repeated conditionally; and in general the more necessary the sacrament is, the less grave is the doubt which would justify its repetition. Now this conditional baptism has nothing at all to do with the validity of the former sacrament. The priest's intention is to baptize only on condition that the person is not already baptized; it is not his intention to baptize if the person has been baptized. Consequently he does not invalidate the former baptism, and in this point, too, the good Bishop does not understand Catholic theology.

The method followed in the reception of converted heretics is a very simple one: "Investigation must be made in each individual case as regards the validity of the baptism received in heresy. If on examination it is found out that no baptism was conferred, or that it was conferred invalidly, the converts are to be baptized absolutely; if a probable doubt remains, then they are to be baptized conditionally; finally, if it is clear that the baptism was valid, they simply make the profession of faith. Now a doubtful baptism as regards the validity of the marriage is to be considered as valid. The question of the doubtful baptism of a heretic has been answered time upon time by the Sacred Congregations in this sense. In the face of all this, what judgment is to be made of the following sentence? "So that even when both parties to a marriage are baptized persons, unless they are Roman Catholics the marriage is merely a legal contract." It is not; it is a sacrament, and this is the teaching of the Catholic Church. The Bishop continues: "Whatever difference there may be as to theory, the practical fact is that Rome regards as dissoluble the marriages of all unbaptized persons, marriages between an unbaptized person and a baptized Christian who is not a Roman Catholic, marriages between a Roman Catholic and a non-Romanist, baptized or unbaptized, which has been contracted without dispensation." And the Bishop is rash enough to say: "If this is true, and I believe it cannot be denied, it certainly follows that Rome cannot proclaim herself the special guardian of the institution of marriage." Now let us see. Rome does not hold that all

marriages of unbaptized persons are dissoluble, but that they are intrinsically and extrinsically indissoluble as long as both parties remain in infidelity. Rome holds that marriages contracted between baptized and unbaptized persons without dispensation are no marriages at all; that marriages between a Roman Catholic and baptized non-Romanist with or without dispensation are intrinsically indissoluble and once consummated can be dissolved by no power on earth. So that what the Bishop says is not true. He could have found the Roman teaching in the Council of Trent and in Gury. He might well have spent his time in learning what our theory and practice is, and if he had done so, he would not have been led into these errors. Misrepresentation may blind unthinking men, but it will open the eyes of the thoughtful to the deplorable condition of the Protestant doctrine of marriage.

He is afraid that Rome's marriage laws will work evil in our land. But the Bishop would do well to read with care the great Pontiff Leo's letter on this whole question of marriage. We quote the following:

"In the great confusion of opinions, however, which day by day is spreading more and more widely it should further be known that no power can dissolve the bond of Christian marriage, whenever this has been ratified and consummated; and that of a consequence those husbands and wives are guilty of a manifest crime who plan, for whatever reason, to be united in a second marriage before the first one has been ended by death."

The Plenary Councils of Baltimore speak in like terms. There never was a time when Rome did not cry aloud at the least sign of danger, no matter whence it came. And the present writer believes that there are few serious educated Protestants to-day in this country who do not in their hearts admit that Rome is the staunchest defender of the marriage bond. Rome and divorce! They are deadly foes. Rome and the marriage tie! The voice of the one has ever safeguarded the sanctity of the other. But the Bishop is disturbed by the law of impediments, dispensations, and so forth. Is the Bishop in earnest? Is he blind to the immense good that follows to the human race in consequence of them? Take, for instance, consanguinity. Why does the Church forbid marriages among blood relations to the fourth degree? In order that Christian charity and conjugal love may be more widely diffused. Surely it makes much for the welfare of society that marriage be permitted only among those who are not bound by the ties of kinship. Does it not safeguard the moral law and hold that familiarity, which naturally exists among relatives, within its proper bounds, when they know that they may not be united in lawful wedlock? Is it

not conducive to the physical well-being and development of the race? Are not unions of blood relatives often fruitless? Is not the offspring frequently physically degenerate and mentally deranged? "Is it not also," says Leo XIII., "a great blessing that for the purpose of spreading more widely the supernatural love of husbands and wives, she [the Church] has decreed marriages within certain degrees of consanguinity or affinity to be null and void; that she has taken the greatest pains to safeguard marriage, as much as possible, from error and violence and deceit; that she has always wished to preserve the holy chasteness of the marriage bed, personal rights, the honor of husband and wife and the security of religion?" These are some of the reasons why she has established impediments, and these appeal to every right-thinking man.

Ah! but those dispensations! There's the rub! In certain impediments dispensation is *never* given; these are, defect of consent, substantial error, violence or fear, a valid existing marriage, consanguinity in the straight line and in the first degree of the collateral line, affinity in the first degree of the straight line when it arises from lawful wedlock. There are other impediments in which dispensation is *hardly ever* granted—thus certain classes of the impediment of crime—sacred orders. There are still others in which dispensation is granted, but only for *very grave* causes; thus the second degree of consanguinity, especially when it touches the first degree, spiritual relationship between the one who baptizes and the one baptized, a certain case of crime, defect of age, clandestinity. For the other cases less grave causes suffice. What is the practice of Rome and her Catholic children? Do the faithful as a body observe these laws or not? Let the Bishop look around him and he will see that they do. Catholics as a rule do not marry when they fall under these laws. The practice of the faithful is in keeping with legislation. But does not Rome dispense? She does in exceptional instances, and thereby proves her inherent wisdom and prudence. For cases may arise in which the superior may consider himself bound to relax the obligation of the law as regards a certain individual, while it still binds the rest of the community. And in this way the common good itself is safeguarded. For the welfare of the pact redounds to the common weal and the legislator must look out for the community, yet so as to have care, too, of the individual members, and thus he should dispense to relieve their distress in given cases. When a law which works for the well-being of the community prevents the good of this or that private person because of some imminent danger or greater benefit which is impossible of attainment on account of the law, then indeed to dispense helps on the whole body and is just.

And here in passing be it said that the Bishop is a little hazy in his notions when he tells us that Rome multiplies possibilities of remarriage by innumerable grounds of dispensation and countless definitions of prenuptial sins or prenuptial impediments. When the Church dispenses, she makes it possible for parties to marry who could not marry before, to elicit a valid consent which they could not do before. How this multiplies the possibilities of remarriage may be clear to the Bishop—we confess it is a mystery to us. The dispensation does not make remarriage, but marriage possible. Or probably the Bishop means that parties who, for example, through ignorance of the existence of the impediment, went through the form of marriage, may now by dispensation have their marriage revalidated; if so, surely this is a blessing, and such a possibility realized in fact is most devoutly to be wished for; and, let me whisper it into the ear of the Bishop, is the constant endeavor of every priest when he finds a couple thus situated. If the Bishop only knew how pastors labor for this end! Let me repeat it, nothing is left undone to revalidate marriages by dispensation and renewal of consent or by sanating them *in radice*. The Bishop does not hesitate to exaggerate. Rome multiplies possibilities of remarriage by innumerable grounds of dispensation and countless definitions of prenuptial sins. It would be more accurate to say prenuptial impediments."

Though diriment impediments are of their nature prenuptial, we are somewhat at a loss to grasp the identity between them and prenuptial sins. When two in good faith contract in ignorance of the impediment which binds them, their conjugal life is not necessarily sinful. Because sin is a voluntary transgression of the law. These know nothing of the law as it binds them, and consequently they commit no sin. If, on the other hand, with malice prepense and knowledge, two such persons endeavor to contract without dispensation, this is a sin, their life is sinful, but surely their sin is due to their own bad will and not to the law. Is a lawmaker who legislates for the common good responsible for his subjects' violation of the obligation that binds in conscience? Is the law, in our case the impediment, identified with their sin? "To be *more* accurate," the Bishop said. There is no accuracy in the statement at all. Again, we are told *that the grounds for dispensation are innumerable*. This is also false, as the Bishop might have learned had he looked up the instruction on matrimonial dispensations sent out by the Propaganda or the ordinary text-books of moral theology. *And the definitions of prenuptial impediments are countless!* If they are, then they are something like the good Bishop's errors in his article. For I assure him that these are very many. But the im-

pediments are also not countless, and they are all founded on the highest grounds of public welfare.

"The important question, it seems to me," remarks the author, "is not the ability of Rome to defend herself against merely verbal criticism, but the impossibility of defense against the immoralities resulting from the definitions of impediments." [Here again he falls into the same error already mentioned and the defense is not only impossible, but perfectly obvious.] "The declarations of nullity and the dispensations for marriage afterward, often only discovered and declared, and used as reasons and excuses for getting rid of an unhappy marriage and finding a way of entering upon another." Now let us see the practice of Rome. In the encyclical we have so often quoted Leo XIII. speaks thus: "Lastly, since we well know that none should be excluded from our charity, we commend, Venerable Brothers, to your fidelity and piety those unhappy persons who, carried away by the heat of passion and being utterly indifferent to their salvation, live wickedly together, without the bond of lawful wedlock. Let your utmost care be exercised in bringing back such persons to their duty; and both by your own efforts and by those of good men who will consent to help you, strive by every means that they may see how wrongly they have acted; that they may do penance and that they may be induced to enter into lawful marriage according to the Catholic rite." And Catholic priests all over the world follow this counsel of the Chief Pastor with such unwearied care and love that there are few points in the pastoral charge that cause more anxiety and unselfish devotion than this. Their whole intent and in the vast majority of cases the practical effect of their labors is that such unhappy unions are righted and God's blessing given the penitent pair. This is so true in actual practice that the case in which a declaration of nullity is given is rare, the ordinary remedy being revalidation, as the Bishop could have discovered by looking more closely into our text-books or by asking any experienced priest. [See Feije, "De Dispensationibus Matrimonialibus," n. 595. Gasparri, "De Matrimonio," n. 1,120 et seqq. Answer of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, 13 Sept., 1760, and other answers.]

When the Sovereign Pontiff himself and the Sacred Congregations and our text-books and the daily experience of priests tell us what the practice is in this matter, may we not justly complain of a man who in writing an article on the theory and practice of Rome shows that he does not grasp the theory and utterly misrepresents the practice? When the chanceries of our dioceses are a living testimony to the revalidations of marriages, is it not pure calumny to say that "Rome justifies and practically sanctions what amounts to

divorce, although it is not called so in the freest possible manner unless both parties to the previous marriage are Roman Catholics?"

In extreme instances the nullity of the preceding union may be declared and subsequent marriage allowed. But first this is neither divorce nor the equivalent of divorce. Where two lawfully married persons are divorced and then after separation enter another marriage, their life is not conjugal at all; it is simple concubinage. When two invalidly married persons enter, after a declaration of nullity, another marriage, their second union alone is lawful wedlock. Again, such declarations of nullity are not and cannot be called divorce. Thirdly, such declarations are very rare in comparison with the vast numbers of lawful unions and of those unlawful ones that have been revalidated. Fourthly, such declarations are not made until it has been proved to evidence that the previous marriages were null and void, and that, too, against a specially appointed canonist whose business it is to defend the vinculum. No loop-hole is left in this matter for fraud, many petitions are rejected and the ones that are granted are comparatively very few indeed, as the Bishop might have seen had he looked into the "Acta Sanctae Sedis." How outrageous then it is for him to impugn our honesty by saying "that Rome justifies and practically sanctions what amounts to divorce, although it is not called so, *in the freest possible manner*." The strictest laws are laid down and, humanly speaking, deceit is almost impossible. Rome, then, in her practice and theory not only does not multiply the possibilities of remarriage, but actually minimizes and reduces them to the smallest number.

To sum up, the Bishop has misrepresented the Church of Rome in a way that is so offensive as to shock all who are acquainted with our real belief and practice, and to remind us of those that have eyes and see not, ears and hear not. He has stated as Catholic teaching what is not Catholic teaching. He has shown himself to be ignorant of Catholic practice. He tells us he has read Gury's work carefully and proves that he did not understand him.

It would be useless to follow him any farther. He has been refuted by anticipation in every text-book of Catholic theology. His insinuation against Rome's integrity in her practice is unworthy of his high position, is founded on ignorance of fact and will bear but little fruit in the hearts of honest men. Nay, more. He knows his statements are controvertible, for he tells us: "I am quite aware that this paper is open to criticism, to controversy and to contradiction." It is also open to the more serious charges of want of knowledge of the subject matter, of gross misrepresentation of Rome's theory and practice, and finally of extreme rashness, for what are we to think of an author who boldly states as truth in a

magazine of such high standing as the *North American Review* what he himself declares to be open to criticism, to controversy and to *contradiction?*

TIMOTHY BARRETT, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

WHO ARE THE REAL THEOLOGIANS?

WHILE the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church was sitting in Boston last October Dr. Brophy, a professor of theology in the Brighton Seminary, took occasion to tell in the Boston *Herald* some of those truths that never can be told too often, even though the telling of them wound the feelings of Protestant Episcopalians very deeply. In a hot little pamphlet Father Van Allen, of the Church of the Advent, in Boston, rebukes not only Dr. Brophy, but also Dr. Brophy's chief, "the Bishop who boasts of being Peter's successor."

This pamphlet the *Churchman*, of New York, reviews admiringly. For the author it has only words of praise; for Dr. Brophy, only words of blame. It tells us that he is perverse and malevolent; that he appeals to an audience—we should prefer *readers*, but the mistake, except as an evidence of heat, is unimportant—invincibly ignorant; that he is a controversial Thersites, making grotesque assumptions and uttering vituperative assertions. We might dwell upon the rugged strength of this language, its lack of the fine culture characteristic of the members of the Protestant Episcopalian Church, but so generally wanting in those of the Italian communion. We shall not do so. We are content to put the article aside with other elegant extracts against the inevitable hour when our Catholic writers shall be blamed once more for their shortcomings in the matter of "sweetness and light."

But in presenting Dr. Brophy to the world in his true colors, the *Churchman* brings up an old accusation against the Catholic Church at large. "It is worth while, from time to time," it says, "to call attention to the sacrifices, ethical and intellectual, that the Church of Rome demands from those who are attracted by the military perfection of her organization." That the organization of the Society of Jesus is military everybody knows who knows anything. It is governed by a general, whom, nearly thirty years ago, *Punch* drew according to popular credulity, in a cassock loosely thrown over a general's uniform complete to jack-boots, spurs and a huge sabre. But that the Church also in her organization is military is something new. Theology teaches that she is a society

complete and independent, capable therefore of making laws and of compelling obedience to them. It is this that produces in her, as in any well ordered human society, that perfect subordination of inferiors to superiors which is the envy of the Protestant Episcopal Church. This, too, calls itself a complete society, yet it does not find obedience or subjection within itself. But instead of recognizing in its sect an imperfection on this account, a lack of social unity, the *Churchman*, in the jaunty style so common among Episcopalians, denies by implication that such harmony of its members is an essential perfection of every complete society by making it a note of an organization exclusively military.

This unconscious misconception of the constitution of the Church, the effect of Episcopalian looseness of thought, introduces us to the subject of this article, the alleged intellectual inferiority of the Catholic clergy to those of the Protestant Episcopalian Church. This inferiority, which in its allusion to the intellectual sacrifices required by the Roman Church, the *Churchman* implies, others openly assert. Clergymen who have made their scanty studies, no one knows where, whose library consists of a few hand-books of controversy, take a lofty tone in speaking of those who have served, as did Jacob for Rachel, their seven years in the schools before entering upon their life as priests. They speak of them as unscholarly, no theologians, as if they themselves possessed the sum of all scholarship and had sounded every depth of theological science. What their scholarship and science really are can be shown by example.

Some few months ago a clergyman whose conscience had been violated by the action of the General Convention in sending missionary Bishops to Cuba and Mexico, wrote to the *Living Church* on the subject.[1] His letter was modest, well worded and to the point. The theologian and canonist of the *Living Church*, taking a high, magisterial tone well calculated to impress the writer of the letter and all who think with him, acknowledged that in sending Bishops to those republics the Protestant Episcopal Church had violated the letter of the eighth canon of the Council of Nicaea, and then proceeded to give reasons to justify the act.[2]

Before considering these reasons, we must remark that one who says: "The letter of the law is violated," insinuates the correlative: "The spirit of the law is kept." To show this, therefore, should have been the justification of the act. But this the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* did not attempt. Perhaps he felt instinctively that to do so would be to run the risk of bringing

[1] *The Living Church*, Dec. 3, 1904.
[2] *Ibid.*

out clearly how incompatible with the ideas of the Fathers of Nicaea is the modern branch theory of Episcopalians. However this may be, in each of the six reasons he tries to show either that the action of the convention does not touch the canon, which, if this be the case, is not violated either in the spirit or the letter; or that circumstances compelled the ignoring of the canon, which in such a case may easily have been violated as well in the spirit as in the letter. Here, therefore, one may see another example of the loose but pretentious thinking by which the leaders of Anglicanism impose upon their simpler brethren.

It is necessary to premise, also, that as these reasons take for granted the branch theory of the Church, they cannot have even a *prima facie* value for Catholics. We shall therefore discuss them in part at least from a Protestant Episcopalian point of view.

The first reason brought is necessity. The Catholic Bishops and clergy in Mexico and Cuba will not give the sacraments to Protestant Episcopalians. This reason savors curiously of jesuitry. It is an unblushing application of the famous principle: "The end justifies the means;" and the *Churchman* may learn from it that ethical sacrifices have to be made by those that resist Roman seductions as well as by those that succumb to them. Moreover, is there no alternative? Do the Catholic Bishops and clergy refuse unconditionally to admit Protestant Episcopalians to the sacraments? There used to be a theory much in vogue that a true Catholic should conform himself to the legitimate branch of the Church in the region where he finds himself; that by frequenting the ministrations of Anglican chaplains south of the English Channel, no less than by attending on those of Roman priests north of it, one becomes guilty of the sin of schism. Could not the General Convention have recommended this theory to Protestant Episcopalians in Mexico and Cuba as a rule of conduct? The *Living Church* might ask: "Would you have them confess and communicate surreptitiously, as do the doctrinaire supporters of this theory when traveling in Europe?" By no means. We hold such conduct not merely dishonest, but even sacrilegious. Let them simply conform. "But," would reply the *Living Church*, "Roman Bishops and priests require as a condition of communion that Protestant Episcopalians should renounce their own branch of the Church Catholic." Well, they could hardly do otherwise. They scout the branch theory and look upon Protestant Episcopalians as heretics, with regard to whom the apostolic injunction is clear. Besides, the branch theory notwithstanding, Protestant Episcopalian Bishops and clergy will not receive Catholics to communion unless these renounce their own Church by denying its doctrines. "The General Convention could not recommend

Protestant Episcopalians to abjure their own religion," might continue the *Living Church.* "This would have been to stultify itself." We do not see how that can be helped. We simply remark that when a theory leads necessarily either to jesuitry, sacrilege or self-stultification, there must be, according to the laws of logic, something the matter with it.

The second reason depends for its validity upon the first. "The Latin-American nations," says the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church,* "are lapsing, or have partially lapsed, from the Catholic faith. If, therefore, the first justification gave us the right of entry into these lands, the second makes it our duty to do what we can to restore those who have fallen in the same lands, after we have entered them." If, therefore, on the contrary, the first justification is, as we have shown, powerless to give a right of entry, nothing is left for Protestant Episcopalians but to get out as quickly as possible of the lands they have entered under false pretences, no matter how much the condition of the inhabitants may appeal to them.

Moreover, the second reason includes a three-fold assumption: First, the lapse, at least partial, of the Latin-American nations; second, the inability of the Roman Church to restore them; third, the efficacy for such a work of Protestant Episcopalianism. We deny all three. The Latin-Americans are not lapsing from the Catholic faith. To each individual we may say almost as confidently as did St. Paul to King Agrippa, "I know that thou believest." With regard to Cuba and Mexico, the very clergyman whom the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* would instruct, Rev. Burr M. Weeden, bears witness to the falseness of the charge. "There is disregard of religion," says he in his letter to the *Living Church,* "in Mexico and Cuba as in the United States. The Church there has forfeited in part her hold upon the people as she has here. I have traveled extensively in Cuba and Mexico, and I do not hesitate to say that Christian piety and the grace of Christian character are quite as common there as among us."

It is impossible for a Protestant to get at the inner life of a Latin-American family. Yet it is almost as impossible to persuade ordinary tourists of this. Their assumed superiority, which with Protestant English-speaking races has become the next thing to an article of faith, leads them to despise the Latin races in their hearts. When some individuals of these receive one politely and talk of things indifferent in complimentary tones, when in club or office men tainted with liberalism or adept in Freemasonry say the things they think will be most agreeable or take him to see what experience has taught them most gratifies the sensual appetites of

the English or American traveler, he fondly thinks that he has drawn them out, discovered the emptiness of their hearts, and applying the old rule, *ex uno disce omnes*, announces that the whole nation is falling away from the faith. He little dreams what contempt lurks beneath the polite exterior. Strong in his self-conceit, he cannot realize that he, in his turn, is despised as an English or Yankee heretic; that the religious thought of his hosts is as sedulously concealed from him as ever the faith was by early Christian from pagan Roman or Greek, and for much the same reason, uncomplimentary though Scriptural, "Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast thy pearls before swine, lest they turn again and rend you."

Mr. Weeden was a traveler of another class. Nevertheless, his opportunities of observing the religion of the Cubans and Mexicans was limited by the distrust these have of Americans, especially when the American is a Protestant minister. Hence his testimony is especially valuable because it comes from one who, from the nature of things, could see only what lay on the surface. We freely grant his assertion that there are in Latin-American countries those who disregard religion. There must be everywhere. But it is also true that the visitor to those countries is more likely to meet the irreligious than the religious. The Latin-American is irreligious because he has fallen under the influence of Freemasonry, which often controls the government entirely, always to a certain degree. Hence the men in public office are Masons, the men of business are infected with Masonry, and these are they whom the traveler usually comes in contact with in the great cities. They are hostile to the Catholic religion during their lives because they are the instruments of the world-wide anti-Christian society, which, persecuting the Catholic Church, looks upon every Protestant sect as an ally. But they are not therefore necessarily lapsing from their faith. When they are face to face with death, how many send for the priests and the sacraments they have warred against during life, those same priests can tell, but the Protestant tourist can never know.

The theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* assumes the inability of the Catholic Church to restore religion in Latin-American countries. In this he directly contradicts those who have the greatest interest in the matter and the best means of knowing its facts, the Bishops and clergy on the one hand, who labor confidently to preserve and increase religion, and their Masonic enemies on the other, who by legislation and brute force do all they can to cripple its activities. That they are far from the success the *Living Church* believes them to be on the point of achieving, is evident from their

constant striving after more efficacious legislation, a more rigorous application of force. If, instead of frequenting the company of only the enemies of the Church, tourists in Latin-American countries would go to the Bishops and heads of religious orders and ask for the number of those, men as well as women, who make their Easter, hear Mass, attend to the religious education of their children, belong to pious confraternities and call for the rites of the Church in their last hour, they would get statistics that would astonish them.

But, supposing the Catholic Church incapable of supporting the tottering faith of the Latin-Americans, it is not easy to see what the Protestant Episcopal Church can do in the matter. Mr. Weeden in the letter the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* would answer testifies that "the infidel and immoral classes in Latin-America name themselves Protestants;" and it must be remembered that there no distinction is made between Protestant Episcopalians and other Protestant sects. Bishop Kinsolving seems to admit that in Brazil his flock, small as it is, consists principally of aliens and the excommunicated.[3]

Bishop Aves has not been long at work in his new field. All he can write is that his first service in the capital was followed with a great deal of interest by a congregation that filled the church to its utmost capacity.[4]

A Protestant Bishop conducting service in the City of Mexico must no doubt have been an object of interest, and it is natural that he should be enthusiastic at the opening of his career. Nevertheless, he would hardly wish us to look upon the interest manifested by his hearers as signs of a tendency towards the Protestant Episcopal Church in those of them who have lapsed from their Roman obedience. He has probably been spending his leisure hours in seeing the sights, and may have visited, with no little show of interest, the cathedral and other great churches of his new home. Should he have done so, the Archbishop would not therefore have been justified in looking upon him as a prospective convert, nor would the Bishop of Dallas be disturbed on that account with fears that he had forgotten the admonition of the consecration sermon not to swerve from his own steadfastness. The venerable Bishop may recall a spring day in 1860 when, a young man, he perhaps attended another Bishop newly come into his diocese on a visit to a gathering of Indian children. "We sang heartily," wrote the Bishop, "and when we finished we found a remarkable impression had been produced." Any one who ever had the privilege, not of

[3] Boston *Transcript*, Oct. 19, 1904; *The Churchman*, Oct. 29, 1904.
[4] *The Living Church*, Feb. 11, 1905.

hearing, but of seeing the first Bishop of Columbia sing a hymn, can well believe that this performance left the little Indians, to use his own words, "reverently hushed in a fixed and thoughtful manner." But the Songish Indians of Victoria, though impressed, remained unconverted; and we are persuaded that when Bishop Aves has been as long in Mexico as Bishop Kinsolving has been in Brazil the Mexicans also will still be unconverted and his congregation will be made up, as is that of the elder prelate, of aliens and excommunicated Freemasons.

After being in Havana a single week Bishop Knight writes that his hands are full, the work is enormous, the opportunity golden.[5] It may seem strange that Bishop Van Buren, who used similar language regarding his work in Porto Rico, did not have the same experience in Cuba.[6] But Bishop Knight explains that his arrival happened at the psychological moment when reforms instituted by the Church of Rome were turning out to be failure. Still he is careful to add that if the Protestant Episcopal Church is to take advantage of the golden opportunity it must prove to Cubans inclining towards the new gospel that it has come to stay. Therefore he asks sympathizers in the United States to build him a "noble" cathedral. "This will be the key to unlock the door to great success." It is a roseate dream, but it does not explain the "enormous work," unless indeed this be part of the dream, to disappear with the awakening. Like Bishop Kinsolving, he tells how the officials of the republic and the newspapers are on his side; from which we may conclude that his congregation, too, will be composed in greatest part of aliens and excommunicated Freemasons.

The third reason alleged on behalf of the sending of Protestant Episcopalian Bishops into Latin-American countries takes us to a higher plane. "We justify it," says the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church*, "on canonical grounds. Canons of discipline were never intended to bind so closely that they might never be reconsidered. Very many of them are allowed, for good reasons, to be dead letters." He quotes some examples of this from the same Council of Nicaea, that, according to him, decreed that there shall be but one Bishop in one city. Thus at certain times all must pray standing and not kneeling; deacons may not sit amongst priests; Bishops, priests and deacons may not pass from one city to another, but must remain in the place for which they were ordained.

Granting, for the moment, the principles laid down in the beginning of this reason, we must remark, with regard to their application, that the reconsideration of a law belongs to the legislative

[5] *The Churchman*, Jan. 28, 1905.
[6] *The Churchman*, Oct. 22, 1904.

authority that made it. No inferior authority can do anything in the matter. Hence the General Convention was incapable of reconsidering the law in question. Nothing less than a general council could do so, and this no general council has ever done. Again, for a law to become justly a dead letter it is necessary that there be a general consent regarding its inapplicability in existing circumstances, its actual non-observance and the tacit consent of the supreme authority. It is evident that these conditions are not verified with regard to the prohibition of conflicting jurisdictions, and therefore that it has not become a dead letter.

But is it true that *all* canons of discipline can be reconsidered or become dead letters? In the alleged justification canons of discipline are evidently opposed to dogmatic canons; and it is assumed that, though these are irreformable, those are subject to change. This assumption ignores the distinction between things forbidden because evil in themselves and things indifferent in themselves that become evil because forbidden. As for the canons quoted as having become dead letters, it is not at all sure that such is absolutely the case. But it is clear that the matter of the first, namely, the position in prayer, belongs to the category of indifferent things that may become evil when forbidden, but which may again become indifferent when the prohibition is no longer enforced. The matter of the second and third, namely, the place of the deacons in the church and the passing of Bishops and priests from the city for which they were ordained to others, considered in itself, is also indifferent. Hence such canons as these may be reconsidered or become dead letters.

But when the matter of the canon is forbidden because it is evil of its own nature, there can be no question of its being reconsidered or becoming a dead letter. Thus, for instance, when we find prohibited in canon iii. of this same Council of Nicaea, the dwelling in priests' houses of women other than those above all suspicion, we never dream that the prohibition, because it is disciplinary, can be abrogated. Another striking example of things forbidden because wrong in themselves, is to be seen in the very canon xviii. which the *Living Church* brought forward as one that has become obsolete. It was cited by the theologian and canonist of that newspaper as merely forbidding to deacons the apparently harmless practice of sitting among the priests in church. As a matter of fact, its scope was to regulate serious abuses of which deacons were guilty in certain places during the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. It forbade them to administer the Holy Eucharist to priests; it reprobated their practice of taking communion themselves before the celebrating Bishop had received, and finished by telling them to keep their

own place and not even to sit among the priests. As all can see, the things forbidden by this canon differ amongst themselves in their nature, and he would be reckless indeed who would dare to assert, not that it is obsolete, but even that it ever can become so.

Now the maintainers of the branch theory have always agreed with Catholics that the matter of the prohibition of two episcopal jurisdictions in the same place comes under the category of things forbidden because they are evil. If, therefore, the *Living Church* would convince them that they are wrong, that the prohibition may be retracted or become obsolete, it will have to prove that the co-existence of two conflicting jurisdictions is a matter indifferent in itself. As its theologian and canonist does not seem to have access to the canons of the Council of Nicaea in their entirety, we shall give him what help we can in his task by informing him that canon viii. does not forbid, formally, the co-existence of conflicting episcopal jurisdictions. Its scope is to prescribe what is to be done with Novatians coming to the Church; and when it treats of the conduct to be held towards the reconciled Bishops, it uses for the foundation of its legislation the inadmissibility of co-existing episcopal jurisdictions as a first principle that all acknowledge. How a first principle can become obsolete is not very clear.

The fourth reason is that Roman Bishops in Latin-American countries are not diocesans in the Nicene sense, but simply vicars of the Bishops of Rome, exercising only a delegated jurisdiction in those lands. Even if this were true, it must be remembered that the branch theory does not suppose for a moment the Roman, the Greek or the Anglican branch to be up to the Nicene standard. On the contrary, it takes for granted that each has its own shortcomings due to our unhappy divisions, which as they can be cured by no human effort, must be endured with patience until God in His good time shall bring back the unity of Nicene times. The cardinal point of the whole theory, therefore, is that we must accept the branch churches as they are. None may dwell upon the deficiencies of his own so as to stir up a spirit of dissatisfaction; and with equal reason none may pry into the deficiencies of another. Anglicans must bear patiently with heretical Bishops and clergymen; Orientals must be content to have them fossilized, ignorant and dependent upon a civil power infidel in great part; Latin-Americans, to have them as degraded as the missionary reports make them out to be. All this is but a trial of the individual's faith. Hence it ill becomes a theologian and canonist of the Anglican branch to pass judgment on the way that Bishops are appointed in the Roman branch.

From the supposed fact that the Roman Bishops in Latin-American countries have only delegated jurisdiction from the Bishop

of Rome, the *Living Church* concludes that they are without any legitimate jurisdiction whatever. The process is very simple. The Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction over those regions, therefore he cannot delegate any to his vicars. If such be the case of Roman Bishops, that of Protestant Episcopalian Bishops is, if possible, worse. What jurisdiction they possess they derive from the General Convention, which according to popular opinion in Latin-America at least, has much less authority to send its Bishops thither than the Pope has to appoint his own. Moreover, they are not accepted by Latin-Americans as are the Roman Bishops. It would seem, therefore, that according to the canonist and theologian of the *Living Church*, jurisdiction may be duplicated in Latin-American lands because as yet there are no lawful jurisdictions there. If this be so, they may be triplicated and quadruplicated ad infinitum.

The *Living Church* admits that the Roman Bishops in Latin-America have *de facto* jurisdiction, which means in plain language that they are usurpers. Admitting this, one is forced to the strange conclusion that they are usurpers of an authority which never had a legitimate possessor; for from the introduction of Christianity into Latin-America, only Roman Bishops have governed its churches; that they are usurpers of an authority of which no legitimate claimant exists, of which there is not the remotest prospect of a legitimate claimant appearing. Whether there can be in the Church, as in civil society, a usurper possessing authority *de facto* but not *de jure* is perhaps doubtful. If, however, it be admitted, it is because the principles whence the possibility is derived for civil society are held to be applicable to the Church also. But if this be so, there is no reason why the consequences of these principles should not be pushed as regards the Church to their last conclusions to prove that in it, as in civil society, a usurper may become a legitimate ruler; and so the Roman Bishops fulfilling all the conditions required, could be shown to be lawful diocesans possessing jurisdiction *de jure*.

But for the *Living Church* they are always usurpers. Yet it admits that if they would but minister to Protestant Episcopalians they could lawfully keep the missionary Bishops of the General Convention out of Latin-America. Hence, these also are admitted to be usurpers; a hard blow for Bishop Aves, who preached his first sermon in the City of Mexico from the text: "He that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me;"[7] a hard blow for the Bishop of Dallas, his consecrator. who chose for the text of the consecration sermon: "Take heed unto yourselves and to all the flock over which the Holy

[7] *The Living Church*, Feb. 11, 1905.

Ghost hath made you overseers. . . . Go, teach all nations. . . . Lo, I am with you alway;"[8] and for the Bishop of Louisiana, who at Bishop Knight's consecration preached from the words: "Sir, we would see Jesus."[9]

But is it true, even from an Anglican point of view, that Roman Bishops in Latin-American countries are not diocesans in the Nicene sense? To begin with, the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* mistakes egregiously when he says that they are but vicars of the Bishop of Rome with only delegated jurisdiction. The Catholic Church distinguishes very sharply between vicars-apostolic and diocesans. Theologians dispute as to whether the Sovereign Pontiff is for these a medium through which they receive jurisdiction from Christ, or whether this is conferred by Christ directly upon the one whom the appointment or approbation or consent of the Holy See has designated publicly as the one chosen to rule a certain portion of the flock. The latter opinion is held by many, including the famous Jesuit, Vasquez. The former is the more common, but no accepted opinion teaches that the diocesans of any country are only vicars of the Bishop of Rome.

Now Anglicans agree with Catholics that jurisdiction comes to a Bishop from Christ through some concrete fact. The origin of jurisdiction is unchangeable; the fact by which are designated the Bishop and the diocese he is to rule may change. According to Anglican ideas this may be nomination by an apostle, election by the Bishops of the province, by a chapter, by the General Convention, popular election, royal nomination, the peculiar process followed in this country when the General Convention is not in session. Why then may it not sometimes be Papal appointment? The national character of churches is an important point in the branch theory. In Latin-American countries the Roman Church is the legitimate national church. If the national church chooses that Papal appointment shall be for it the concrete fact to determine the person in whom episcopal jurisdiction is to reside and the diocese over which he is to exercise it, we do not see how Protestant Episcopalians can consistently refuse to admit that Bishops so determined are diocesans in the Nicene sense.

The fifth reason is a strange one. Rightly or wrongly, it says, some have undertaken the work. This being the case, it is better that the whole Church should direct it with superior wisdom than that it should be left to the limited prudence of a mere section of the Church. Utility, apart from morality, is here brought out strongly. Whether the work be right or wrong, we are compelled

[8] *The Churchman*, Dec. 31, 1904.
[9] *The Living Church*, Dec. 31, 1904.

to take it up. One is tempted to ask: "Would it not be better to examine into the right or wrong of the matter, and if it prove to be wrong, to stop it?" But he remembers that Anglicanism has not the military organization of the Church of Rome. The reason reminds us of the sentiment attributed, we believe, to Commodore Bainbridge: "My country! May she always be right! But, right or wrong, my country!" Such lack of principle in a sailor may be treated with some indulgence. In a theologian and canonist it calls for reprehension.

The sixth and last reason amounts to this. The Church has resolved to support these missions. She is responsible; you are not. Pay your assessment for missions. Only five per cent. of your contribution will go to such as trouble your conscience; ninety-five per cent. to those of which you approve. Perhaps the theologian and canonist of the *Living Church* had in his mind what Mr. Mantalini said of the half-penny, and thought concerning the five per cent. what the dignity of his position forbade him to utter. However this may have been, he offers his correspondent this choice bit of commercialism to salve his conscience, and leaves him puzzled perhaps by the show of learning the six reasons contain; but, if we mistake not, as unsettled as ever in his soul.

HENRY WOODS, S. J.

San Francisco, Cal.

THE INSIDE OF THE AGLIPAYAN CHURCH.

VERY few, even among those resident in the Philippines, understand the real import and tendencies of the "Philippine Independent Church," which was founded by Gregorio Aglipay, one of the native priests, a couple of years ago, and has been keeping the Filipinos ever since in a chronic state of turmoil and unrest. It has been written up in newspapers and periodicals as a laudable and natural revolt against the spiritual tyranny of Rome, such as produced Protestantism in the sixteenth century. According to this view, the Filipinos, under the protection of the American Government, are now shaking off the yoke of Rome as their minds are opening to the light of the Gospel. This ready and plausible theory, industriously circulated by Aglipay and his companions, has had the effect of throwing dust in the eyes of the American people and blinding them to the true inwardness of the situation. The truth is, the movement is not religious, but political. Under the guise of religious zeal, it conceals the elements of revolution; patriotism, as understood by the Filipinos, and not religion, is the

hidden spring that is producing its febrile activity and its peculiarly violent and aggressive character. It is simply a phase of the revolt of the yellow against the white man, one of those self-assertive movements of the Asiatic races within recent years which, rightly directed, has led to the development of Japan and, wrongly directed, to the excesses of the Boxer movement in China and the formation of the bloody Katipunan society in the Philippines in the early nineties. Owing to its essentially political character, Aglipayism has been able to combine elements the most incompatible, judged from a religious standpoint, and has induced believers and unbelievers to work in unison for an end which appears religious to the uninitiated only. The amity of Protestant bodies also has been sought for and obtained, but it counts for nothing and is held of little account except as a blind. What, however, is truly remarkable is that the movement has the active support of professed atheists and free-thinkers, of revolutionists who never enter a church or think about religion, of men high in the grades of Latin Freemasonry, who are pledged to extirpate Christianity, all of whom are utilizing the revolt of Aglipay for a common end.

The immediate cause of the schism was not doctrinal differences, for Aglipay broke away from Rome while still believing all she taught; it was disappointed ambition. If the Pope had thought fit to raise Aglipay and other native priests to the episcopal sees and place entirely in native hands the spiritual guidance and temporal emoluments of the parishes, the schism would never have taken place. But this was not to be, and could not be—hence the revolt. In spite of the well-known desire of the Catholic Church to foster a native priesthood in all countries, it seems a long way off before the desire can be fully accomplished. If we look around among the colored races to whom Christianity has been preached for the last three or four hundred years, we find that up to the present time the great work of propagating and preserving the faith is done by missionaries from Europe, and that the native priests are few and far betweeen. This is not owing to absence of facilities for entering the ranks of the priesthood, but to lack of true vocations. A bishop of a diocese in Mexico has complained lately that for the last sixteen years his seminary has been able to produce only one priest, though it has been in good working order, and for the last five years has been in the charge of four zealous Vincentian fathers, a congregation that has the care of the education of priests in several parts of Europe.

In the Philippines, too, every facility was given to the natives, during the three centuries and a half of Spanish occupation, to enter the priesthood. Seminaries were built specially for their use, and the university in Manila was freely open to them. But though

the ordained natives were generally some hundreds in number, many occupying important parishes, they never showed that they were capable of distinguished positions, and the great bulk of them had of necessity to be under the immediate direction of the Spanish friars. Though they were better off, as regards numbers and positions, than the native clergy in most other tropical regions, they posed as an oppressed body of men. But if that plea had any foundation in the Philippines, it would hold with much greater force against the European missionaries in other countries. Profoundly dissatisfied with their position, though showing no outward sign of it by their demeanor, they took a leading part in organizing the revolt at Cavite in 1872, for complicity in which three of them, Gomez, Burgos and Zamora, now regarded by the Aglipayans as martyrs, were executed and some others banished to the Marian Islands. Several of them, later on, including students in the seminaries, joined the Katipunan society and were privy to its murderous programme. Three of them had to be executed for complicity in the Tagalo rebellion of 1896. Two years later, on the coming of the Americans, the great majority ranged themselves on the side of the revolutionists, and such was their warlike spirit that they threw off the soutane and dressed in military costumes. In Vigan the grotesque spectacle was afforded every evening of the students of the seminary going for their usual constitutional round the town dressed as soldiers, with their director following them done up as an officer. Needless to say that their deeds during their war with the Americans are still a topic of conversation. Sometimes openly and sometimes in secret they took an active part in the war, and many are the accusations of foul play alleged against them.

It is well to take these facts into consideration to form an opinion of the character and real aspirations of the ecclesiastical leaders of the Aglipay movement. It is is not religion that troubles them, but patriotism, as they understand it. At heart they are all fanatically opposed to the white man, be he Spanish or American. Aglipay voices the feelings of his party when he declares that he will never rest satisfied till all the friars and the Jesuits and the nuns are banished from the islands, and he adds that they do not want priests of any other nationality, American or Frenchman or Italians. The watchword is "the Philippines for the Filipinos," a phrase which Isabelo de los Reyes, who claims to be the real founder of the Aglipayan Church, explains to his own satisfaction when he says in his "Religion Katipunan" that the Philippines will never be a perfect country till all the government, civil, military and ecclesiastical, is in the hands of the Filipinos.

The banishment of the Spanish friars and the confiscation of their property was long mooted in the Philippines by the Spanish anti-clericals, both through motives of hatred to religion and because they hoped for some personal gain at the division of the spoils. The cry was taken up from them by the Filipino revolutionary party, most of the members of which had passed some years in Spain. It was early understood by the latter that this would be the first step towards independence. This irreligious campaign had the sympathy of the great majority of the native clergy, who, if it were successful, would enter into possession of all the parishes in the archipelago. Since the revolution they have gained their point; all the parishes, with some insignificant exceptions, have been under their charge for the last six years, and the deplorable results of the change can be testified to by all residents in the Philippines.

What, however, is apparently inexplicable is that although the friars have been scattering during the past few years, till less than a fourth of their number remains, most of whom are cooped up in Manila, the cry against them has grown more furious as time has gone on. Not a day passes in which they are not attacked by the vile Filipino press. Aglipay exhausts his vocabulary of vituperative terms against them whenever he speaks in public. The ready explanation that will come to the minds of most Americans is the memory of past tyranny and oppression. Nothing is further from the truth. I have argued with Aglipayans on this crucial question, and although at first they would blurt out the usual grievances of the friars keeping them in ignorance for three hundred years and denouncing them to the Spanish authorities, they changed their tone so rapidly on being asked for proofs that it was plain that their first statements were mere catch-cries in the mouths of a profoundly ungrateful people. The world has never seen such a huge display of ingratitude as that shown by the anti-friar party in the Philippines, for they owe everything they have to the friars. It is often said that if you do a Filipino a favor you make an enemy of him. This has certainly been the experience of the friars, for Rizal and some other prominent anti-friar writers received great benefits from the orders they wrote against. Aglipay would never have been able to become a priest only for the Dominicans. He was brought as a child to Manila by his uncle, who was concierge at the Dominican convent, and was kept gratis at the Dominican College of St. John Lateran's. As his parents were extremely poor and not able to supply him with books and clothes, these also were given to him by the fathers. What memory of oppression can this man have? What impels him to go about reviling his benefactors? He seems to have friars on the brain, his rabies being especially apparent

in his violent pamphlet, "Frailocracia," from which it would appear that the whole Church is ruled by friars, including the Pope, whose commands they set at defiance.

These shameful and spiteful exhibitions are the outcome of ungovernable passion; reason has very little to do with them. Those who talk wildly about the Spanish friars are people who are raging because the Americans took possession of the country just as they thought they had independence within their grasp; and having to adopt a hypocritical and servile tone to their conquerors, owing to the strict censorship of the press, they vent their bile on the Spanish friars, as a bad-humored man will ill-treat his horse when in a temper. It also gratifies the inordinate vanity of the Filipino to be able to rail at the white man, and raises him in his own estimation, while it gratifies his cowardly cruelty to jump on a fallen enemy or one whom he is pleased to consider as such. All this, besides, serves an ulterior purpose; it is like the noisy demonstration in force, made in front of an enemy to distract his attention while a real attack is being prepared on his flank.

Of Aglipayism, as a church with a distinct religious teaching, it is premature to speak. Aglipay himself can give no rational account of his schism, or separation from Rome, other than a tirade of abuse against the friars. Not many who know him will give him credit for religious sincerity. As long as he was in hopes of becoming a Bishop he was a most obedient adherent of the Holy See, quoting Papal bulls and canon law and Catholic theologians in his circular letters to the clergy. Then came his excommunication from the Archbishop of Manila for his usurpation of the ecclesiastical authority. For he had made himself vicar general of the revolutionary army, and had been ordering the priests not to pay attention to the commands of the Spanish bishops. It was after his surrender to the American troops that he resolved, now that his hopes of preferment were blasted, to set up a little popedom for himself. A long conference with Aguinaldo and another with some of the disaffected clergy resulted in his calling himself the "Obispo Maximo," equivalent to the title of Supreme Pontiff, and going through the form of consecrating three times as many bishops as there were episcopal sees in the archipelago. A more intellectual man would try to justify by careful reasoning such an extraordinary transformation. Tirades and abuse and bold assertions are not reasoning, but they seem to be sufficient for him. The Pope is a millionaire; the friars are powerful and tyrannical; the Church of Rome is the church of the friars; the meek and humble little church of the Philippines has arisen, and God has given it His blessing, and so it has grown big and strong; it is under the protection of

Our Lady of Dolores and St. Joseph, etc., with plenty more of this rhodomontade may be read in the pamphlet "Frailocracia." How far removed from the way of the meek and humble are the Aglipayans we shall see later on.

In matters of faith the new church has rapidly developed symptoms of heresy. In the catechism published this year in its bi-weekly organ, *La Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, the fundamental Christian dogma of the Blessed Trinity, Three Persons in One God, is spoken of as an absurdity. The real absurdity is that the Aglipayans, while denying fundamental doctrines and rejecting the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, keep up all the Roman ritual, cultivate modern devotions, practice the cult of the saints and carry their statues in procession, pray for the dead and offer up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Their actions do not accord with their speech. They denounce in public what they themselves publicly practice. I heard one of their young ministers in a set speech denouncing the friars for "preaching false miracles of saints and telling the people that they could get souls out of Purgatory for money," a usual way of speaking against devotion to the saints and Masses for the dead, and nevertheless, impelled by custom, they follow religious practices which come under these denunciations.

The Aglipayans at present, clergy and laity, do not know what to believe, and are drifting they know not whither. There is a rationalist element at work in their body, headed by Isabelo de los Reyes, who calls himself the founder of the church, is the director of its official organ and the president of the council of laymen. Isabelo was closely connected with the revolution, and was imprisoned in a Spanish fortress for sedition. A few years ago he published a little book, "Le Religion Katipunan," embodying the result of his studies on the religion of the Filipinos in pre-Spanish times; and in it he boldly advises the Filipinos to return to their ancient religious ideas. He finds that all religions, Christianity, Mohammedanism and Buddhism, are good, and all are at bottom true. The worship of Bathala, as practiced of yore by the Filipinos, is the same as the worship of God practiced by Christians—just the same thing under different names. It is hard to know exactly what Isabelo aims at in his book, whether a resuscitation of paganism or a form of deism or pantheism, but the tendency of the work is decidedly anti-Christian. It shows the bent of his mind to have added to the book the rules and constitution of the bloodthirsty Katipunan society that was responsible for so many cruelties practiced on Spaniards and Americans. According to Isabelo, all religions being at heart the same and all equally true, and variety of worship being more pleasing to God than sameness, the new Philippine Church justifies its exist-

ence by being distinct from all others and national. It is founded on the Bible, but being a civilized church and the daughter of the twentieth century, it makes use of the latest researches of modern science to interpret the Bible. Isabelo is able to whittle down Christian doctrine as he will, and if he has his way there will soon be very little left for the Filipinos to believe in. He denies the existence of hell and the demon. Aglipay's secretary, writing on this point to the official organ, calls these denials "enormes barbaridades" against the Holy Scriptures, and yet näively observes that Isabelo in his denials is only using the natural rights accorded to him by the Aglipayan Church. For the instruction of the Filipinos, Isabelo has also given them the life of Jesus Christ according to Renan. Modern rationalists are always quoted with approval, but Catholic theologians and the fathers of the Church never. "How could we go back," he says, "to St. Thomas and the Middle Ages, living as we are in an age which has produced Edison, Tolstoi and Flammarion?" though it is hard for ordinary mortals to see what these have to say to theology.

What is the principle of cohesion that binds together men of such opposite points of view—Aglipay, with his devotions, crucifixes and images, and Isabelo, with his scarcely veiled neopaganism, his rationalism and higher criticism? It is the mutual understanding that, under the semblance of religious zeal, both may work together for the emancipation of their race from the yoke of the white man, though on the part of Aglipay and other believers the process adopted means the entire sacrifice of religion on the altar of patriotism. The identical tendency of their minds, one starting from Christian and the other from non-Christian premises, may be perceived in the two pamphlets already referred to. In Aglipay's work, the last chapter, "La Patria," sounds the note of independence in no uncertain key. It is "unpatriotic" not to belong to the "Iglesia Filipina Independiente." He argues that for the country to be perfect it should be distinguished in manners, customs, language and religion from every other country, especially in religion, for that is what distinguishes one country "formally" from another. The very name of Isabelo's pamphlet, "La Religion Katipunan," should be enough to mark its political tendency. The religion of the Katipunan Society, if judged by the fiendish acts of cruelty sanctioned by it during the revolution, is simply a form of Oriental fanaticism, justifying in its ardent pursuit of an earthly and purely political object murder, assassination and robbery.

This secret revolutionary society is in full vigor at the present moment, and a state of things exists in the Philippines which is not unlike what preceded the revolution in Spanish times. Up to lately,

and probably even still, the rents have been collected regularly from the tenants of the friars' estates by agents of the society, ostensibly for revolutionary purposes. Even in such unlikely places as the camps on the great Benguet road, now in course of construction, a member of the society can terrorize other Filipinos into giving him money, as I have been informed by American overseers. From the reports sent in by the constabulary, it transpires that there are numbers of insurrectionary bands and societies, known by the names of "Guardia de Honor," "Dios-Dios" and other appellations, scattered through the country; these being all under a higher organization having its headquarters at Manila, whence all their raids are directed, the orders being transmitted by messengers by word of mouth to escape detection. In a recent rebellious attempt, in the province of Isabela, it also came out in the course of the trial that all the direction of the campaign had been received from Manila. Being in the same boat as the prisoners on their way to Manila, I had an opportunity of chatting with them. I thought it significant that the leaders had been members of the Katipunan Society in Spanish times. From an American lieutenant of Filipino scouts, who was returning from the woods and mountains of La Laguna, where he had been fighting for a month against the so-called ladrones, or robbers, I learned that constant meetings were taking place in every pueblo, furthering the work of a revolutionary society that was spread all over the country. He scouted the idea that the men in arms were ordinary ladrones, and said that they stole nothing at present because they were well supplied with money and ammunition from Manila and Hong Kong. It is known to the authorities that arms have been constantly smuggled into the country, and yet they cannot prevent it.

Mr. Taft and others in authority have placed great reliance on the loyalty of the Federal party, which is mainly composed of the old revolutionary leaders. This is not a party in the sense that there is another party in opposition to it. It is an organization so strong and universal that it excludes all others, and has all the political and civil appointments of Filipinos throughout the archipelago in its hands. There is not a provincial governor and hardly a president of a town who is not a member of the party. It is supposed that there is freedom of election in the Philippines, but in practice this freedom is a misnomer, for men are elected who are in opposition to the great body of the people. The Federal party is exercising a despotism that it would be well to inquire into. Having such power in its hands, we might suppose that the party would be open and above board in everything. On the contrary, it has its secret side, and sends private orders round by word of mouth to members in the

provinces, a practice which does not argue much loyalty to the American Government or regard for American institutions. Whatever may be said for the loyalty of those members who are occupying good positions and drawing large salaries, the great majority are revolutionists at heart, and would rise to-morrow if they thought they had a chance of success. The Federal party is but a poor reed to lean upon in face of the revolutionary Katipunan that embraces all classes.

Those who are well acquainted with the workings of Aglipay's church, such as constabulary officers, secret service men and other officials, several of whom I became acquainted with in my travels round the islands, do not put much faith in the loyalty of its leaders. They look upon it as a revolutionary organization, parading under the guise of religion. The introduction of Aglipayism into a parish is often the signal for disturbances, caused by a few influential men, who have never shown any signs of religion, getting up a faction in its favor and terrorizing the majority of the people. Moreover, most of the places where Aglipayism has been planted are known to the constabulary as centres of sedition. Several of the towns and villages of Pangasinan, Cavite, Cebu and Ilo-Ilo could be cited as instances. I was at an election meeting in one of the southern islands of a prominent Aglipayan candidate for the post of provincial governor, being the only white man present. A carefully prepared speech, read from the manuscript in Spanish, whilst openly anti-friar, was also covertly anti-American, and received great applause. I could not help noticing that although there was a profusion of bunting, the red and blue Katipunan colors being everywhere around, the American flag was conspicuous by its absence.

It is curious to note the number of Tagalos among the young boys who, after a six months' course in the Aglipayan seminary, are sent out to the Visayas and other islands to take charge of parishes. To me they seemed to have nothing to distinguish them from the Tagalo agents who spread the Katipunan in 1896, except that they wear a soutane.

Politics alone will explain the violent zeal for Aglipayism of men who have always been indifferent to religion. In one of the southern provinces, where there are hardly any Aglipayans to be found, except the provincial governor and the doctor, the former forced the people of a small town against their will to receive an Aglipayan priest, displaying his loaded revolver as he escorted the priest to the church. It is worthy of note that this governor had been the principal insurgent leader in that part of the country. He is known to have gotten rich by the money given to him to pay off his troops with, and his immoralities are so numerous and flagrant,

even for the Philippines, that they have drawn a private inquiry from the government.

As a specimen of violent opposition to the Catholic Church take the following: Some months ago the people of Dumanjug, a town of Cebu, were assembled to hold a procession as a thanksgiving to God for the disappearance of the cholera from the parish. The parish is very large, containing 22,000 Catholics, while just a few people are supposed to have Aglipayan sympathies, almost the only open Aglipayan being a man who was president at the time. Just as the procession was about to start on its way round the grounds of the church the president drove up in his carriage, displaying his revolver and accompanied by the municipal police, and forbade it to take place. No remonstrance was of any avail. It is curious how in the Philippines one influential man can tyrranize over thousands. This man stood practically alone in his opposition, for even the police acknowledged to the priest afterwards that they came against their will. Fortunately, the priest telephoned immediately for protection to the constabulary post at Barili, a town a few miles off, and an American officer with eight constables were sent to Dumanjug, and arrived to protect the procession in the afternoon. The indignation in Barili was so great that the volunteer police and many of the principal inhabitants came along with the constables. When they arrived they found that the president was still determined to put down the procession. He had gone into the church accompanied by a man on horseback, who was shouting out insults to the people assembled there. The officer put them both out, and as the fellow on horseback was contumacious, he had to throw him off on the ground to silence him. Then the procession took place without further disturbance. The president on another occasion, seized on all the musical instruments of the band belonging to the church, alleging that they belonged of right to the municipality. On an action being brought against him by the priest, he was obliged to restore the instruments and pay costs and damages. I got these facts from the priest at Dumanjug when I visited the town, and they were repeated to me on another occasion by the American officer.

The Aglipayan president of an important town in the province of La Laguna has been in the habit of utilizing the police for services they were never intended to perform. On the birth of a child a policeman is sent to notify the parents that they must get it baptized by the Aglipayan and not by the Catholic priest; on a death taking place, the family is told that they must get it buried by the Aglipayan. The police are also employed to work up the attendance of the Aglipayan Church. On last Holy Thursday the president sent them round to all the families who had statues that were usually

carried around the town in the Good Friday procession. These now got orders to send the statues to the Aglipayan procession, and it was intimated that if they sent them to the other they would be fined. By this means the Aglipayans managed to get up an imposing show, though it was noted that many who had been forced into it went to the Catholic Church in the evening. In his determined zeal for the new church, the president also wanted to fine parents for sending their children to the priest for catechetical instruction, and asked permission of the governor of the province to do so.

In the town of Cebu about six months ago the Aglipayans determined to hold an opposition procession at the very time the Catholics were holding theirs, in order to raise a conflict in the streets, but were obliged by the authorities to postpone it for some hours. The two processions presented a great contrast. The Catholic one showed the usual array of women, who in the Philippines have formed the bulk of every religious procession. The Aglipayan demonstration, on the other hand, consisted principally of some hundreds of men, among them being bodies of volunteer police carrying their lances, sent in by Aglipayan presidents of neighboring pueblos. This spectacle gave the procession more of a military than a religious appearance, and was significant of underlying motives.

In the town of Ilo-Ilo, after the Aglipayan church was built, the police were directed to do all they could to prevent the people belonging to that part of the town where it was situated attending Mass in the Catholic church. Men were stationed for this purpose at the end of a street through which it was necessary to pass to get to the Catholic church, and they exercised such intimidation that out of numbers who used to come only a few women remained who were bold enough to disregard municipal displeasure. I myself have seen a policeman in this very spot on a Sunday morning with his baton in his hand looking menacingly at every one who seemed to be going to Mass.

The audacity displayed by the Aglipayan presidents in the persecution of Catholics, who form in many instances the entire body of the population, can only be explained on the theory that they are known by the natives to belong to a strong political organization, which has its ramifications everywhere and possesses the power of terrorizing. They are all, of course, members of the Federal party. In addition, it is not too much to surmise that the real foundation of their strength lies in the fact that they belong to the Katipunan, now as vigorous as ever, though working in secret. As ordinary isolated individuals, even though in the enjoyment of presidential powers, they could never act as despotically as they are now doing with impunity.

The employment of atheists and pantheist free-thinkers to fill important posts in the Aglipayan Church must serve to discredit it as a real religious movement, even more than the untoward zeal of political firebrands. The editor of the Aglipayan organ *La Verdad,* is an atheist. The treasurer of the Aglipayan church in Cebu is a free-thinker. He gets all the receipts, rents a house for the priests and supplies them with food and raiment. How much of the money received is used for church work and how much for political purposes is not stated to the public. The man who was treasurer last year at Dagupan is also a noted free-thinker. He made himself very prominent in getting up disturbances on the return of the Dominican friars to take possession of their college. On that occasion he got into an argument with an American Protestant who spoke to him about his disgraceful conduct. "Do you believe in God?" said the American, thinking this argument unanswerable. "I believe in space," was the cynical reply.

In connection with Dagupan it will not be out of place to relate a peculiar incident that gives an insight into the extraordinary practices of the Aglipayans, the outcome of ignorance. A young Irish American Catholic came to confession and communion one day last year in the church in Manaoag, where I happened to be staying. He was also asking advice about marrying a certain native girl, and promised to come again and see about the matter. A few weeks afterwards, as I was driving into Dagupan, an American stopped me and asked if I knew So-and-so, naming the young man. On my replying in the affirmative, he informed me that the Aglipayans had baptized him the day before, and pointed out to me an old man who had acted as sponser. It appears that the young man, who was of weak intellect and not fully responsible for his actions, thinking that he would get to the marriage quicker by going to the native priests, had applied to them to sanctify the union, and they, in order to make, as they thought, a good beginning, had gone through the sacrilegious farce of re-baptizing him.

Incidentally, the Aglipayans are able to make a good deal of money out of the baptisms of Chinese. The Spanish friars had always had difficulties about baptizing the Chinese in the Philippines, having a long experience of their insincerity, and used to put them through a long probation. The Chinese there often desired to become Christians either with a direct view to marriage or because they imagined that the change in religion would help them in their business. These cases are now taken up readily by the Aglipayans, who, for a consideration of one or two hundred dollars, will baptize them without any preparation or instruction. But this disregard for the sanctity of baptism need not surprise us; Agli-

payanism all along has disregarded the essentials of all the Christian sacraments while professing to believe in them. How could a priest consecrate himself a Bishop, or a priest, parading as a Bishop, ordain priests? How could boys, having no real orders, say Mass and hear confessions? They say that they are not Protestants, nor rationalists, nor Romanists. They are, indeed, a little of all, combined in such heterogeneous fashion that they do not understand their own minds. As a political force Aglipayism has strength and unity; as a religion it is a mass of contradictions. It may go on for a time in its blundering way, but eventually the more intellectual of its members will drift into atheism, and the bulk of those whom it gains among the common people will fall back into the superstitious practices of heathenism from which they were weaned by the Spanish friars.

At the present time they think themselves above taking their religion from the white man. Their vanity gives them the air of independence and superiority. When the cry was got up against the Spanish bishops these, thinking it was on account of their being Spaniards that the tumult was raised by the anti-clerical party, resigned their sees that the Pope might give them to others. It was thought that the American bishops would smooth all difficulties. But these are also badly treated, and are constantly being insulted and reviled in the Aglipayan organs. The *Democracia* described them as "dogs of the same kind with different collars." Bishop Dougherty, of Vigan, was stoned by an Aglipayan crowd, and Bishop Rooker's life has been twice attempted, being on one occasion shot at, and at another time, while crossing a swollen river on a raft, the rope was maliciously cut and the raft put at the mercy of the current. It is a mistake to think that these outrages are the spontaneous outburst of the people's feeling in the provinces. They are presumably directed from headquarters, just as are the operations of the ladrones.

It will surprise most people to learn that the new church has got its canonized saint. Dr. José Rizal was solemnly canonized by Gregorio Aglipay about a year ago. The Aglipayans may now pray to him as a glorious saint in heaven and take him for their model. It is hard to see, however, what Rizal had done to entitle him to these honors. He had the Filipino vice of ingratitude abnormally developed. He set his father on an unjust no-rent agitation against the Dominican friars, to whose fostering care his family owed all they possessed, for they came to the estate very poor. He carried on traitorous practices for years, pretending all the while such friendship for the Spaniards that he was treated with great consideration even after he had been found out. He lived publicly for

years with a woman to whom he was not married, and only consented to marriage an hour before his death, in order to receive the last rites of the Church. But all these defects are forgotten in the fact that he died for his country, or, rather, was executed for treason against what was looked on as the mother country. He was not a hero, but he must be made one; he was a sinner, but he must be made a saint of, for he was the founder of the "Liga Filipina" and the life and soul of the Katipunan. Patriotism being the great virtue recognized by the new political church, José Rizal, the patriot, must be its first canonized saint. Rizal is quoted by his Filipino admirers as having expressed the sentiment that he could never bear the white faces. Whether this is true or not, it is believed; and it appears to me that the Rizal cult, though helped on by the Americans, will foster that racial antipathy which is growing more pronounced every day in the Philippines.

At the beginning of the schism Aglipay got sympathy from many Americans in the Philippines, including Mr. Taft, the Governor, but the current of public opinion seems to have turned against him. I was told that the great majority of the American teachers were sympathizers, but in the cases that came under my own observation I observed the contrary. It will not take long for the people of the United States to pass a correct judgment on him and his work when events shape themselves in the form to which they seem to be inevitably tending.

Ambrose Coleman, O. P.

Limerick Ireland.

Scientific Chronicle

PHOTOGRAPHY AND ASTRONOMICAL RESEARCH.

Dr. Perrine's recent discovery of two new satellites of Jupiter, the sixth and seventh, makes an appropriate occasion for recording some of the wonderful aid the art of photography has given and is giving to astronomical research. This application of photography is not much over fifty years old, for although Dr. J. W. Draper made some experiments in 1840, and Bond, of Cambridge (U. S.), obtained his famous daguerreotype of the moon in 1850, it was not until in 1853 Warren de la Rue applied the collodion process of photography, then about two years old, that any systematic and continued work was undertaken. The possibilities of the "wet" plate were, however, limited. To the possibilities of the "dry" plate, first made available, as far as we know, by Dr. Huggins in 1876, there is seemingly no end. Increase in sensitiveness was accompanied by sensitiveness to the rays of the infra-red portion of the spectrum, until the whole solar spectrum could be photographed by means of the so-called authochromatic plate.

The human eye is marvelously sensitive to light, but in two ways it is surpassed by a sensitive film; the eye cannot accumulate impressions, while the film can do so almost indefinitely. Neither is the eye sensitive to many rays which easily make an impression on a film. Consequently, given a sufficiently long exposure, the camera will reveal stars, nebulæ and comets in spaces in the heavens that would remain void to the human retina, even if it were assisted by the most powerful telescope. Added to this power of accumulation is that of registering much at once that the eye could only take in piecemeal. Many vast nebulæ have been revealed in this way and their forms determined. Light has been shed on their formation and constitution, and in many cases our knowledge of their existence is due to the photographs we have made of them. We have even been enabled to trace changes in their form, and measure the velocity with which they are expanding or contracting. Most wonderful of all, recent studies have shown that there is no part of the heavens free from nebulæ and that they exist in each part in great numbers. All this and more is accomplished with the utmost facility. Take the discovery of the asteroids as an example. Four of them had been discovered in 1807, and no more were found for nearly forty years. It took Hencke fifteen years to find a fifth. Wolf, of Heidelberg, enlisted photography in the

campaign, and now they are discovered at the rate of a dozen or more in a year. Six new ones were discovered last January. Oxygen, supposed for a time to be a purely terrestrial element, was detected in a star through the photography of its spectrum. Years of progress are made in a day, and accuracy, of such importance in astronomy, is increased; whatever faults there may be can be ascribed with justice to errors of mechanism or judgment.

In two fields of astronomical research the camera has proved especially valuable, that is in investigating the nebulous regions of the sky and in mapping out the entire heavens, including all stars of the fourteenth magnitude and over. The forms of nebulæ would in many cases have remained unknown if photographs had not been secured of them. This was because of their faintness or because of the small area visible to the eye at any one moment. The eye would have to pass from one part of the nebula to another, even if it were easily visible; whereas it was recorded at once and in its full proportions on a sensitive plate. Who would think when gazing at the Pleiades that instead of the eight or ten stars easily visible therein with the naked eye there are actually over two thousand; that nearly all the larger stars of the constellation which we can see easily have nebulæ attached to them, and that seven aligned stars can be seen on the photograph strung on a nebulous filament, "like beads on a rosary," as a writer has described them?

At the suggestion of Dr. Gill, director of the Royal Observatory at the Cape of Good Hope, an International Congress met in Paris in 1887 and resolved to construct a photographic chart of the whole heavens. The work is now fully three-fourths done, and an idea of its extent can be gathered from the fact that it will take 11,000 negatives to complete it, each negative to be duplicated; it will contain, according to estimate, impressions of twenty million stars, and will be supplemented by a catalogue giving stars to the eleventh magnitude. One can easily judge of the usefulness of this astrographic chart. Not the least purpose it will serve will be the rapid detection of any new star that may blaze out suddenly, as did Nova Persei in 1901.

THE TANTALUM LAMP.

Last year the twenty-fifth anniversary of the introduction of the Edison incandescent lamp was celebrated with becoming festivities and with new honors for the inventor. During the last quarter of a century this lamp has ruled with undisputed sway, at least in

the United States. Now a new lamp appears to dispute that sovereignty; the tantalum lamp, introduced to the scientific world by the well-known firm of Siemens & Halske, in whose laboratories it has been devised. As is well known, the filament of the Edison lamp is made of carbon obtained by acting on a thin filament of bamboo by means of sulphuric acid and charring it. Few other substances could withstand the high temperatures involved. Even the carbon is vaporized after a time, and the vapor is condensed on the inside of the bulb, causing the blackening of the bulb familiar to users of incandescent lights. The lamp is not as economical as it might be. A lamp with a filament of pure metal has been long desired, and one has been prepared.

Messrs. Siemens & Halske have been experimenting for years to obtain an incandescent material that would bear a very high temperature. The account of their researches tells us that they had early come to the conclusion that the visible part of the radiation of an incandescent body increases progressively with its temperature. The higher the temperature, the more light will be obtained. Consequently a material that will withstand the highest temperature will furnish the most economical lamp. Certain metals were known with melting points supposed to be considerably above 2,000 degrees Centigrade. Vanadium, niobium and tantalum, rare elements of the nitrogen group, are three of these. Dr. W. von Bolton undertook for the firm the task of finding out which of these three, if any of them, was suitable for the purpose in view. In the course of his experimenting he determined that the melting point of tantalum alone was above 2,000 degrees C., the figure for this element when pure being 2,250 to 2,300 degrees C. The figures for vanadium and niobium were 1,680 degrees C. and 1,950 degrees C., respectively.

It required considerable time to get tantalum in its pure state. We quote Dr. Bolton's own description of his experiments: "I reduced potassium tantalo-fluoride in the manner prescribed by Berzelins and Rose and found that the finely divided tantalum so produced became fairly coherent on rolling, so that by this treatment metallic strips of it could be made. It was also attempted to work tantalum oxide into the shape of a filament by mixing it with paraffin and to reduce it directly into the form of a metallic thread. In these experiments there was observed for the first time a minute globule of molten tantalum, and this globule was of sufficient toughness to permit hammering and drawing into wire. Following out this observation, tantalum powder was melted in a vacuum and then it was found that the highly heated metal parted with the gases it contained. In this manner I produced my first

filaments of pure metallic tantalum, which were, however, very small. When these had been used in lamps with promise of good results, an attempt was made to devise a definite process of purification. The potassium tantalo-fluoride was reduced to metallic powder; this powder contains a small proportion of oxide and of hydrogen which is absorbed during the reduction. When the powder was melted in a vacuum the oxide and absorbed gas disappeared and a reguline metal remained; on carefully remelting this it became so pure that no appreciable impurities could be detected in it."

The chemical properties of this pure tantalum were found to be very different from the properties of the tantalum described by other chemists, and rendered it eminently suitable for use in an incandescent lamp. On December 28, 1902, the first lamp was made. As it was further improved it was shown that the wire had a tendency to droop when hot, and since the wire necessary had to be more than two feet long, it was obviously impossible to wind it into a spiral; it must be supported in some other way. Experience showed that the best support consisted of a central short glass rod carrying two disks into which arms, bent upward and downward in the shape of an umbrella, are cast. "The upper star," we quote from Dr. O. Treverlein, who devised the mechanical portion of the lamp, "has eleven, the lower twelve arms, each upper arm being in a vertical plane midway between the vertical planes in which two adjacent lower arms lie. Between these eleven and twelve arms, which are bent into hooks at their ends, the entire length of the filament is drawn zigzag fashion. Its extremities, held by two of the lower arms, are connected with the foot of the lamp by means of platinum wires."

Of the efficiency of the new lamp he writes: "Numerous trials for lengthy periods of time at 1 to 3 watts per candle-power have proved the vast superiority of the tantalum lamp over the carbon filament lamp under equal electric and photometric conditions. Expressing this fact in figures, we can state that the tantalum lamp consumes about 50 per cent. less current at the same voltage, with the same intensity of light and the same useful life; or that, at the same economy, its life is several times that of the carbon type. Moreover, at an initial efficiency of 1.5 volts per Hefner candle-power the tantalum lamp has an average life quite sufficient for all practical requirements, so that this rating has been standardized for the 110-volt lamp. Trials have also proved that the lamps have a life of several hundred hours at 1 watt per Hefner candle-power, but in that case they were very sensitive to variations of pressure and often showed an early decrease of illuminating power. The

useful life of the tantalum lamp—*i. e.*, the time within which it loses 20 per cent. of its initial illuminating power—averages between 400 and 600 hours at 1.5 watts per Hefner candle-power. Some specimens have proved to have a useful life of as much as 1,200 hours. The absolute life, in general, amounts to 800 to 1,000 hours under normal working conditions. Further, we have to remark that the tantalum lamp blackens but little unless it has been strongly overheated during work in consequence of partial short circuiting of the filament."

The osmium lamp, used in Germany for some time, has some of these advantages, but the metal is much rarer than tantalum and has bad mechanical properties. All three lamps possess the property of increasing in candle power for a certain length of time and then gradually decreasing. Tantalum is classed among the rare metals, but there seems to be enough for making lamp filaments, as a pound will make some 20,000 of them. In an editorial in the *Electrical World and Engineer* for January 28 of this year an opinion of the lamp is given which will show how the lamp is judged by an expert. "We are inclined to look upon this tantalum lamp seriously as the first important step taken toward a new order of things in incandescent lighting. A glow lamp with a filament of pure metal has much in its favor, and when this metal is refractory enough to stand incandescence up to an efficiency of two watts per candle-power, it begins to look as if something were doing. A two-watt incandescent lamp, it is almost needless to say, can give the electric arc a very hard struggle to retain its supremacy, especially the enclosed arc. We shall await the appearance of the tantalum lamp in commercial practice with great interest, for if it meets the claims of life and efficiency now made for it, the art of electric lighting will have much to be thankful for."

A NOVEL METHOD OF PLANT-FORCING.

On viewing the gorgeous display of flowers in the show windows of our flower merchants the average layman, if he think of the matter at all, will occasionally ask himself how it is that the florist can make winter blossom like the spring and summer. To say that the instrument of his magic is the hothouse, and that the operation is known as forcing is to reply without answering. To satisfy his curiosity our layman must know more. Perhaps a brief resumé of some recent investigations on the subject will supply him with this additional knowledge. These investigations well

illustrate the use science can make of natural phenomena for industrial profit.

Every one can recognize an invariable cycle in the life of plants. After flowering and fruiting in the spring and summer they shed their leaves in autumn and are inactive and apparently dead in winter. A prolonged drought will have much the same effect. But let the spring warmth approach and continue for a few days, and in a surprisingly short time, remarkable to one not familiar with or not observant of plant life and growth, the trees and shrubs have broken into delicate leafage. Horticulturists sometimes say that the plants have awakened; they call their inactive period the period of sleep, and the saying "put a plant to sleep" is frequently used, although in many cases the expression is undoubtedly figurative. But among some plant physiologists this time of inaction is beginning to be looked upon as being a response to some demand of the plant's nature, sometimes increased by the exterior influences of cold, prolonged dryness and the like. Thus this state can be brought about artificially, and if this is done just before the plants bloom the time of blooming can be somewhat retarded. This is one method of forcing. Another consists in taking the plant before it has quite entered upon its period of sleep and in drying it thoroughly. This violent treatment seems to accomplish in six weeks or so what nature takes all winter to bring about, for when the plant is placed in good soil and kept at a temperature of about 90 degrees Fahrenheit, it blooms as it would in spring. Success does not always reward the efforts of the florist; the state of the autumn weather has much influence. However, this method, or some modification of it, is used extensively to secure blossoms out of season.

A Danish scientist, M. Johannsen, has discovered a new way of accomplishing in a day or two what took six weeks in the method just described. It has been known for a number of years that ether and chloroform arrest the development of plants if applied in any quantity; whereas if they were used in very feeble doses they had quite the opposite effect. The Danish professor conceived the idea of utilizing this property of plants in order to force their buds into premature bloom. For this purpose he selected some branches of the willow tree on which buds had already formed and placed them in a vessel with a little ether. After twenty-four hours these branches were plunged into water and planted side by side with some untreated branches, and in two days the buds of the former had opened, while those of the latter had remained unopened.

The details of the commercial application of this process need not detain us. It is successful. Very few failures occur, and plants are in flower four or five months earlier than they would have been under the old treatment.

NOTES.

Some Recent Celestial Phenomena.—During the first two weeks of February a great spot was visible on the sun. It could be easily seen with the naked eye through smoked or tinted glass. In the aggregate it was nearly 90,000 miles long and about half as broad. During the month nine groups of smaller dark spots and eight groups of faculæ were visible at one time. A sun-spot maximum which is due is either near us or upon us. The following is a good summary of the present status of our knowledge of sun spots. It is taken from *Popular Astronomy* for March: "The sun spot is generally considered to be an irregular, black hollow formed in the solar surface by a collection of cooler gases that overload its surface at that place and thereby cause a sink in it, or, if there is less pressure from beneath the surface than the ordinary amount from any cause, the sinking of a portion of it may be caused by its own weight. Surrounding this black patch is a dark cape that is brighter on its inner surface and less so on its outer. Near the outer edge of this penumbral cape and in its vicinity on all sides are pores through which immense volumes of gases are pouring out from the interior of the sun. This condition causes great activity to be apparent usually on all sides of the spot or group of spots which appears to be the centre of the so-called solar storm that is in progress. This plainly gives what may be called a kind of vertical circulation of the solar masses in the region under consideration, an uprush of the highly heated vapors in and near the outer border of the penumbra and a downrush of the cooler vapors that descend through the dark hollow of the spot called its umbra. The depth of sun spots below the general level is very hard to determine. Astronomers think it may vary in different spots from 500 to 2,000 miles. The sizes of different spots vary greatly, and the dimensions of the same spot are not usually the same from day to day. This was notably the case in the great group during the first days of last month. What has been said about uncertainty of the depth and size of the sun spot is equally true of its life or time of existence. It may last a few days or it may exist for more than a whole year. One sun spot has been known to live for eighteen months."

The second magnitude star Castor, in the constellation Gemini, has long been known as a double star. Nine years ago a Russian astronomer discovered that the fainter of the two components had a dark companion. Dr. Curtis, of Lick Observatory, has just discovered that the brighter component has a companion also. The discovery was made by means of the instrument called the spectrograph, which is adding yearly to the thousands of binary star systems already known.

New Year's Eve Time Signals.—On New Year's Eve the United States Naval Observatory sent out telegraphic time signals. The first series lasted five minutes, ending at midnight, 75th meridian time, and was repeated at 1, 2 and 3 A. M. An effort had been made to get all the cable and telegraph companies of the world to coöperate, so that the signals could be sent around the world, but some of the companies declined on the plea of too much business. The signals reached Australia in less than three seconds and Argentina in less than eight. At that rate time signals may be sent around the globe in ten or fifteen seconds. Similar experiments had been made on December 31, 1903, and on September 8, 1904. They have for their main object to make clear the possibility of using one central time centre for the entire commercial world and to bring about, if possible, the universal adoption of standard time and of longitude reckoned from one meridian, that of Greenwich.

Two New Satellites of Jupiter.—On January 4 of this year Professor C. D. Perrine, of Lick Observatory, Mount Hamilton, California, announced that he had discovered a sixth satellite of the planet Jupiter. He had suspected its presence in December last by his photographic study of the satellite system of the planet. On the day following the announcement Dr. Perrine resumed his study of the negatives and discovered a seventh satellite, its nature being clearly shown by its change of position from night to night. Both are very faint bodies, and their distances from Jupiter are given as lying between 6,000,000 and 8,000,000 miles. This makes the sixth discovery of a satellite by an American astronomer. In August, 1877, Professor Asaph Hall discovered two satellites to Mars. Professor E. E. Barnard, in 1892, discovered Jupiter's fifth satellite, and in 1898 Professor W. H. Pickering discovered the ninth satellite of Saturn by photographic aid.

The Seedless Apple.—The seedless orange has become so common that we have almost forgotten that it was a dream a compara-

tively few years ago. Now comes the seedless apple, due to the propagating skill and care of Mr. John F. Spencer, of Grand Junction, Colorado. Several years' work was necessary before he was rewarded with five seedless apple trees. Now he has two thousand, and estimate gives three hundred and seventy-five thousand as the number of nursery trees to be expected by the fall of 1905, and two and a half million by 1906. The apples are coreless, too, and the trees bear no blossoms. This means that the apple will be wormless, for the codling moth will be prevented from depositing its eggs. Loss of fruit from the killing of blossoms by frost will probably be a thing of the past.

Completion of the Simplon Tunnel.—On February 24 the boring of this great tunnel was completed. The work has taken six and one-half years and has cost $15,700,000. From 500 to 700 feet per month was the best rate of advance attained. The success of this low level tunnel is likely to lead to others in the future.

Invar.—A measuring wire that will not expand with rise of temperature, a pendulum whose length will increase so little that it will not vary more than two seconds in twenty-four hours, these are some of the results the new alloy "Invar" will bring about. Professor Guillaume, of Paris, introduced "Invar," which is steel containing about 36 per cent. of nickel, which is characterized by possessing an extremely small coefficient of expansion or by the fact that its specific volume is practically invariable when considered as a function of the temperature." Professor Guillaume has a 24 per cent. nickel alloy which will do away with costly compensation in watches. He has besides a 45 per cent. nickel alloy which can replace platinum in the incandescent lamp.

M. J. Ahern, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews

THE HOUSE OF GOD AND OTHER ADDRESSES AND STUDIES. By the *Very Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.*, of the Catholic University of America. 12mo., pp. 428. New York: The Catholic Library Association, 534 Amsterdam avenue.

It is always a great pleasure to receive anything new from the pen of Dr. Shahan, and his contributions to literature are so rich and meritorious that it is a pleasure to meet them again and again. His learning, his reasoning, his power of expression all combine to make him an exceptionally valuable writer. In his latest volume we have a collection of sermons, lectures, addresses and essays used at various times, but not before brought together for publication. They all show the same careful, conscientious student, the same clear thinker and the same able teacher whom we have before and whom we love to meet again. Dr. Shahan has taught us to look up to a very high standard, and he never lowers it. The present collection offers strong temptations to quote, which we shall not try to resist. See this beautiful description of the House of God taken from an address delivered at the dedication of St. Cecilia's Church, Brooklyn:

"In the venerable books which the Church uses to-day, the Roman Pontifical and Missal, the House of God is described as a city stoutly built upon the mountain-top. Her bulwarks and streets are made of pure gold; her gates are fashioned of rare marbles and inlaid with tiers of brightest pearls; sapphires and emeralds adorn her high walls, which are patroled by hosts of shining angels, and the vast spaces of this celestial city are radiant with the divine light that glows from the throne of the Lord God Almighty. Human language is scarcely capable of uttering the splendid vision of beauty which unrolls before the prophetic eye of Holy Church as she describes to her children the outward aspect of the New Jerusalem. But the Church, which is the spouse of Christ, and therefore the closest sharer of His intimacy, knows more of this marvelous city than its external semblance. It is a place, she tells us, where the prayers of the unhappy and the afflicted are heard; where the sins and transgressions of the world are cleansed; where Christ dwells in unbroken intercourse with His spouse; where the tears and agonies of the spiritual combat are forgotten. It is the home of the multitude, the common resort of the humble and the lowly, the refuge of the outcast and despised. It is the gate of heaven, the vestibule of paradise—a holy, hallowed and a dreadful place, filled ever with the unspeakable majesty of God and echoing

to the adoring whispers of the angelic presences and a rapturous spiritual music too delicate for our gross mortal ears to comprehend."

How striking are these thoughts on the office of the priesthood:

"Venerable brethren, we are the last comers in a long line of priests that stretches back to the Apostles, and in them to the Cross and Cenacle. Our history is the history of the world since first we were sent out into it, the agents and vicars of Jesus Christ. And when all is told, we may be proud of those who went before us. Que homines, they sustained well the shock of conflict, they stood brave and united about the standard of Christ, they delivered to us unimpaired the lessons of His life and His teachings. Like the Lampadophori or torch-bearers in the games of Greece, they have handed down, one to another, through all the centuries, the living flame of knowledge and piety. And we may well turn, as King Ahasuerus did, to the annals of the past to draw comfort therefrom and direction—we shall not be deceived. Quae regio in terris nostri non plena laboris! What culture of the Orient so high and old that we have not conquered it for Christ! What barbarism so pallid and spent that we have not stooped to lift it from the horrors of its moral death! What powers 'in excelsis' that we have not manfully withstood in defense of the rights and ideals of humanity! What patience and persistency have we not shown in dealing with our own selves and in judging, Rhadamanthus-like, with stern severity every lapse from the ideal of our estate and our calling! All other priesthoods were local, temporary, natural, human and imperfect. This alone transcends all time and dominates humanity, taking wings with the rise and accommodating its steps to the decline of man in his varied and successive combinations."

We could go on quoting indefinitely, for these compositions are made up of just such gems as those which we have shown. The book is altogether charming and instructive.

IRELAND'S STORY. A short history of Ireland for schools, reading circles and general readers. By *Charles Johnston*, author of "Ireland: Historic and Picturesque." 12mo., pp. x.—414. Illustrated. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

"Ireland's Story" has been written not as a record of the dead past, but as a beacon for the living future. It is inspired by a belief in the Irish race, now spread far beyond its island home, through many lands, beneath many skies. The Irish race has a great part to play in the history of the future; and present and future can be understood only by a knowledge of the past.

The story of Ireland may be viewed in many ways. First, as a part of universal history; its ancient traditions are rich and full of clues to the races of the early world; its archaic treasures are abundant; its old stone monuments wonderfully preserved. In illumining the shadowy dawn of early Europe, and especially of those northern lands whose children now lead the world, no country can aid us so much as Ireland.

Then we must reckon Ireland's early heroic poems and tales, ampler than those of any European land, save only Greece and Italy, and giving us the truest and richest picture of the archaic life of Europe, still untouched by Greece and Rome. The great personages of the Irish epics stand out as clear as the heroic figures who fought around Troy or inspired the leaders of Attica and Sparta and the City of the Seven Hills.

Next comes Ireland's part in the drama of faith. Ireland may well be called the Ark of the Covenant; for in the little western isle was stored up the treasure of the Gospel, brought thither first by Patrick. Preserved miraculously from the barbarian raids which swept away the Roman Empire and covered Europe with heathen conquerors, this treasure was presently brought forth and carried abroad, first to Great Britain, then to Belgium and France, Switzerland, Germany and Austria, Italy and Spain and even to the twilight confines of Norway and Iceland. Beautiful illuminated manuscripts from Ireland rekindled the learning of Europe, after the barbarian conquests of the Goths and Vandals, Angles and Franks.

From the following epochs of Ireland's story there are many lessons to be learned, but the best of them is this: that in the life of nations there works a providential destiny, not only in prosperity, but in adversity, and perhaps most of all in adversity; that in Ireland's life this Providence working through conquest, oppression and misery, has miraculously preserved the pure spirit of the race in its pristine unworldliness and faith, its belief in holiness and in the spiritual world, and that this spirit so preserved and now dispersed through many lands, is to-day one of the great treasures of humanity.

Every reader of the Irish race will find here a tale to make him proud of his parentage and his inheritance; a tale of valor and endurance, a tale of genius and inspiration, a tale of self-sacrifice and faith. Such a one thus looking back proudly to a worthy and noble past may look forward with hope for the future and with a sense of consecration for the spiritual destiny of the Irish race.

So much for the subject. Now for the author. He is thus described by an admirer:

"Mr. Johnston is a ripe scholar, a man of varied attainments, a

wide traveler and accomplished linguist, a thinker, a man of the world and a clever writer in a great many fields. He was born in Ballykilbeg, in the County Down, Ireland, in 1867, and was educated in the Dublin University. Mr. Johnston is the son of the late William J. Johnston, M. P., of Belfast, better known as Johnston of Ballykilbeg, long famous as one of the most vigorous, persistent and yet honest opponents of Nationalism in Ireland; yet out of this cradle of things anti-National, with an educational training and official experience calculated to make his antipathies deeper and more lasting, he has come by sheer force of native honesty, spiritual sincerity and intellectual independence, to be one of the most earnest, logical and outspoken advocates of Nationalism and Celticism Ireland has produced in this decade. Tory and anti-Nationalist, landlord and master of an Orange lodge as the father was, he was a kindly, lovable, charitable old man, a good neighbor, a considerate master utterly devoid of the persecutor's spirit and after his lights a sturdy lover of his country; and not the least of his son's triumphs was that of his book 'Ireland' and his attitude on affairs Irish, made the sturdy old father in his declining years acknowledge that he was wrong and his son was right."

With an author so well fitted to his subject good results should follow. The reader will not expect literary display or dissertations on the philosophy of history in a 12mo. volume of 414 pages which begins with the legendary races 2,000 years before Christ and ends with the Irish in America and in the British Empire at the present time. The book is a very brief, though complete, rapid sketch of Irish history from a sympathetic though truthful pen, well done and attractively put together. It stands alone.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE SINCE THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES. By *Johannes Janssen.* Vols. VII and VIII. Translated by A. M. Christie. St. Louis: B. Herder. Price for both volumes, $6.25, net.

These two volumes, representing Volume IV. of the German original, carry the history of Germany through the wild period which intervened between the hollow "Pacification" patched up at the Diet of Augsburg in 1555, down to the equally hollow "Formula of Concord" promulgated in 1580. All hope of restoring religious unity in the "Holy Empire" had been abandoned; and, in accordance with the terms of the Peace of Augsburg, each petty prince was made supreme lord and master of the consciences of his subjects. The only bond of union amongst the Protestant rulers, then as now, was their common hatred of the Catholic Church, from which they had apostatized. Unless when roused to united action

against the Catholics, Protestantism presented the wretched spectacle, characteristic of all heretical sects from the beginning, of endless and hopeless divisions and sub-divisions. Not only did the original cleavage between Lutheranism and Calvinism still continue to exist in the Protestant ranks, but within the Lutheran party itself the discord of the "theologians" gave rise to perpetual schisms and unseemly wrangling. The bare enumeration of these sects, each of which, in true Lutheran style, consigned all the others to hell-fire, would fill a whole page of this REVIEW. The story has been repeatedly told, oftenest by Protestant writers, but by no one in so masterly a way as by Janssen. With no attempt at rhetoric, and for the most part permitting the actors to state their case in their own words, his narrative moves along with almost epic dignity. No historian has ever surpassed him in the art of marshaling his facts, keeping always in view the logical sequence of events. His description of the revolt of the Netherlands and of the religious wars of France, backed by contemporary documents, will be found particularly valuable.

Janssen is at his best when he turns from this discordant Babel to consider the majestic figure of the Catholic Church. The most interesting chapters of the present volumes are those devoted to the Council of Trent, the Roman catechism and the heroic efforts of the German Jesuits under their incomparable chief, Bl. Peter Canisius. In the following passage, summing up the results of the labors of the Fathers of Trent, he becomes eloquent:

"Herewith the dogmatic work of the Council was finished. From out the well-nigh unravelable coil of reproaches, attacks, misrepresentations and calumnies, which half a century had wound round the Catholic Church, her likeness now stood forth pure and spotless, and in complete inner accord as to doctrinal and moral teaching, organization and worship. Her dogmatic connection with the apostolic past was clearly set forth at all points; the reform had been grounded, not on externals, but on the inward sanctification both of individual life and of the universal community of the Church."

The translation, though not as perfect as so accurate a work should be, is a great improvement upon the earlier volumes. For the benefit of those who shall wish to read Janssen intelligently, we give a list of all the errors that obscure or pervert the sense. In Volume VII., page 36, read "letter *of* Duke Julius." On page 60 read Frederic II. The "George Grenger" mentioned on page 200 was not an *opponent*, but a *defender* of the false opinions of Constance and Basle. Likewise, page 294, Musculus *verfocht* means Musculus fought *for*, not *against*. On page 317 read *Peace of Augsburg* instead of *Augsburg Confession*. On page 44 of Volume VIII.,

read *William* instead of *Frederic*. On page 83, read "submission of Prussia *to* Poland." On page 86, read "Luebeck must cut off." On page 134, John Casimir leads troops, not *against*, but *in aid of* the Huguenots. Same page, read "salaries paid by France *to* German Princes." Page 150, line 19, read year 1566. Page 170, line 10, *Turk* should be *work*. Page 176, read "who had defended Brenz" instead of "whom Brenz had defended." On page 203, by rendering "mein Herr Vater" with "my lord's father" the whole sentence is made nonsensical. Page 286, "*worship of Mary*" is a poor rendition of *Marienverehrung*. An English Catholic would have said *veneration of Mary*. On pages 309 and 310 the translator has made Janssen's narrative of the intrigues of Count Joachim of Ortenburg quite unintelligible by twice styling the Count a *Duke*. Finally, on page 349, read Elector Palatine instead of Count Palatine.

These are all the errors of any moment which we have discovered during a very careful perusal of the two volumes. Whilst they might and ought to have been avoided in so scientific a work, the prime characteristic of which is absolute accuracy, yet they do not seriously impair the general excellence of the translation, and we extend to the translator and to the publishers our sincere congratulations. They have fully supplied the want which was so keenly felt of a complete and thoroughly reliable work in English on the subject of the Lutheran Reformation. It may take some time to upset inveterate myths and lies, but in the end the truth will prevail.

A Life of Shakespeare. By *William J. Rolfe, Litt. D.* One volume, cloth, 8vo., illustrated, $3.00. Same, one-half morocco, $5.00. Boston: Dana Estes & Co.

"This monumental work includes all the known facts and reasonable conjectures regarding the life and works of Shakespeare, treating among other matters of his ancestry and birth, education, marriage, life at Stratford and London, literary production, closing years and death, and the subsequent history of the poet's family. The notes, index and bibliography are unusually full, and the book contains the most complete account of the typographical peculiarities of the first folio that can be found in any authority. Doctor Rolfe gives, so far as his limits allow, the evidence for the facts of Shakespeare's life, and the reasons for accepting or rejecting current traditions and conjectures. He has been notably fair in stating theories of other scholars which he has felt obliged to criticize, and has generally allowed the advocates of different views to speak for themselves, thus permitting the reader to judge as to which authority

is in the right. Together with full critical discussion of the various plays, Dr. Rolfe has given in this volume a more detailed analysis of the 'Poems' than has been before attempted in a work of this character. Above all, the book is human, vital and sympathetic, and will prove as fascinating to the lay reader as it is valuable to the scholar. The volume contains over 550 pages, printed from new type on heavy paper, and with wide margins. It is illustrated with eight full-page etchings and photogravures."

Thus for the publisher. The author says:

"My aim has been to give the main facts, traditions and conjectures concerning Shakespeare's personal and literary history, adding so far as my limits allow the evidence for the facts and the reasons for accepting or rejecting the traditions and conjectures. Biographers have never agreed and probably will never agree on many of these doubted or disputed matters. I have endeavored to be fair in stating theories and opinions which I feel obliged to criticize, generally letting their authors or advocates speak for themselves, and leaving the reader to judge whether they are right or I am.

"More than one biographer has begun by quoting what George Steevens wrote somewhat more than a hundred years ago: 'All that is known with any degree of certainty concerning Shakespeare is that he was born at Stratford-on-Avon; married and had children there; went to London, where he commenced as an actor and wrote poems and plays; returned to Stratford, made his will, died, and was buried.' And Tennyson is reputed to have said: 'The world should be thankful that there are but five facts known to us about Shakespeare: the date of his birth, April 23, 1564; his marriage at nineteen to Anne Hathaway; his connection with the Globe Theatre and with Blackfriars; his retirement from theatrical life with a competency to Stratford, and the date of his death, which took place upon the anniversary of his birth, 1616.'"

The book may be said to have come into life through tribulation. In the preface we read:

"The manuscript of this Life was finished, except for the notes, in May, 1901, and from the beginning of June to the middle of September was kept in a safety vault at Cambridge. In October it mysteriously disappeared from my library. Though I had little doubt by whom it was taken, the evidence was purely circumstantial; and for that and other reasons it was impossible for me to make any effort to regain possession of it. The person who took it intended after reading it to return it without betraying himself, but he was afterwards tempted to put it into other hands with a false statement of its history, possibly with a view to its being

utilized, in part if not as a whole, in print. This can hardly be done with safety, but it has complicated the affair and interfered with the return of the manuscript in time for it to go to press as promised.

"I have therefore been compelled to undertake the depressing task of rewriting it, and the present volume is the result. Whether it is better for being twice-told I cannot say, but I am inclined to think it is no worse."

It may be well to say to the purchasers of the New Century (subscription) edition of Shakespeare that this life was written as a supplement to that book, and to other persons that this is the first time that it has appeared independently. We feel that Dr. Rolfe's reputation as a Shakespearean scholar and writer makes further comment unnecessary.

THE SUFFERING MAN-GOD (L'Homme-Dieu Souffrant), or, The Divinity of Jesus Christ Resplendent in His Sufferings. By *Pere Seraphim*, Passionist. Translated by Lilian M. Ward. 12mo., pp. 239. London: R. & T. Washbourne. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Although it may be said that most standard subjects, even including those of a sacred character and those of the spiritual order, have been treated so frequently and in such various ways as to be practically exhausted, and although it may be suspected that the multiplication of books on some of these subjects rather confuse than enlighten the public mind, there is one grand exception, and it is the Divinity of Christ. On this subject by far too little has been written, and it is so deep and so many sided as to be exhaustless. We cannot help thinking that if more short treatises or tracts were made on the subject from different standpoints and scattered broadcast over the world, that infidelity would be put to flight. Infidelity is the meanest and ugliest cur in the manger, and all curs are cowards.

The book before us is an illustration of the thought in our mind. In it the author leaves the beaten path and attempts what at first might be an impossible task, to trace the Divinity of the Saviour throughout the different stages of His Passion. He thus declares his own purpose:

"The Divinity of Jesus Christ is not a question to be discussed; it is a fundamental principle solidly established, outside of which no other foundation can be laid. 'The Word was made Flesh and dwelt amongst us . . . full of grace and truth' (St. John i., 14). These simple and sublime words of the Apostle St. John established at once the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and they contain at the same

time the announcement of the supernatural position to which man was raised by Him.

"In placing the Divinity of Jesus Christ as the basis of religious belief, these words would have us understand that the Word was made Flesh—the Son of God became Man. Jesus Christ is the only door, as it were, by which God has come personally to us and the only means by which we can penetrate into the infinite treasures of His Divine Being. When we speak of the Divinity of our Saviour in this work we do not regard it as a question which requires to be either elucidated or proved; we speak of it as an already established principle from which we must start in order to draw the salutary conclusions which emanate from it and which will lead us to procure for ourselves that eternal happiness to which we all aspire.

"Glancing at the Gospels we see everywhere reflected the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Taking them page by page it would be easy for us to write a large volume on this subject, so worthy of the study of every true Christian. In this little work we have confined ourselves to the one drama of the Passion of our Saviour. We have endeavored to show how the Divinity of Jesus shines forth resplendent in the midst of the insults and abasements of His Sorrowful Passion, and how the humiliation and sufferings which He endured, far from detracting from His Divinity, do but serve to show it forth with a more brilliant splendor."

INSTITUTIONES METAPHYSICAE SPECIALIS quas tradebat in collegio maximo Lovaniensi. *P. Stanislaus de Backer, S. J.* Tom. III. Psychologia pars altera. Psychologia De Vita Rationali. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne et Cie, 117 Rue de Rennes, 1904. Pp. 288.

With the present volume Father de Backer's "Special Metaphysics" reaches the close of the second stage of its development. The preceding ground was covered by one volume on "Cosmology" and another on "Organic and Empirical Psychology." The volume at hand completes the psychological section by furnishing the speculative or more purely metaphysical side of the subject. In respect to its object matter it is the most important of the entire work; for in it the nature, origin and destiny of the human soul are explained and established in the light of principles partly gathered from the preceding discussions and partly carried on in the opening chapter of the present volume itself. In accord with the method dominating the work, the inductivo-deductive, the superiority of the human mind over that of the animal is established at the outset on the basis of their respective activities. The way is thus prepared to demonstrate the spirituality and simplicity of the

principle of thought and volition in man. The author has wisely, we think, given the larger share of attention to the proof for the soul's existence, as a real substantial principle distinct from the organism, for here indeed is the crucial problem and the one against which the strongest attacks of empiricists are directed. Once the reality of the soul as an enduring substance is solidily established its specific properties can be demonstrated with comparatively little difficulty.

The relation of the soul to the body is treated by the author more succinctly than is usually the case in works of the kind, because subjects here pertinent, such as sleep, dreams, hypnotism and kindred phenomena, have been anticipated in the preceding volume, owing doubtless to their presenting a more physical than spiritual ingredient. It is also customary in kindred works to treat of the functions of the intellect and will prior to entering on the nature of their principle, the soul's nature. The author has inverted this procedure and given the former subjects the second place. He doubtless discovered an adequate advantage in thus arranging his material, though to the reviewer's thinking the logical no less than the practical interests of the work have not been thereby as well subserved as they would have been by the reverse order. However, the matter is one of only secondary importance.

For the rest we have only to reaffirm the opinion registered in our comments on the earlier portion of the work—the present volume like its predecessors continues the best traditions of philosophy as it has always been conserved in the society to which the author belongs. It is at once solid and thorough in argument, and yet unmistakably clear in method and exposition. The scholastic student can hardly fail to profit by its reading.

THE SPIRIT OF SACRIFICE AND THE LIFE OF SACRIFICE IN THE RELIGIOUS STATE. From the original of *Rev. S. M. Giraud*, Missionary Priest of Our Lady of La Salette. Revised by Rev. Herbert Thurston, S. J. 12mo., pp. 500. New York: Benziger Brothers.

In his preface the author speaks of the life of the monk and nun, second in excellence to the priesthood only, and of the many excellent writers who have been inspired by so grand a theme. He then speaks of his own purpose in these words:

"We, in our turn, have attempted to be of service to them in the work of their sanctification, a work of such vital importance. The treatise we now lay before the reader treats of the religious state from the special point of view of the victim's self surrender. We employ the word victim here, although on the title page of this

work we have preferred to speak of the life of sacrifice. The sense is the same in both, but we thought it best to make use of the latter term lest our announcement might seem to suggest some singularity of doctrine and practice. It will, however, be seen that the standpoint we have chosen is anything but a fanciful or unauthorized one. The view we take of the religious life is, in fact, by no means new; every author who has selected this beautiful subject as his theme points it out, but without enlarging upon it; whereas what we propose to consider in the religious state is pre-eminently the life of the monk or nun as a victim.

"We cannot but think that this view of the religious life is not only a true one, but also one which imparts to it a character eminently weighty, elevated, profound and calculated to inspire souls consecrated to God by solemn vows with more generous aspirations, holier dispositions. The contents of this work may be summarized as follows:

"1. The religious is, in very truth, a victim offered to God in union with Jesus Christ in His divine sacrifice.

"2. In this character he ought to be devoted entirely to God, to His interests, to His glory and completely sacrificed to His good pleasure.

"3. In order to accomplish this end his life is a life of humility, poverty, chastity, mortification, modesty, obedience.

"4. He takes delight in entire seclusion from the world and finds rest and peace in solitude and silence.

"5. Finally, charity, tender, strong, constant, supernatural charity, pervades and vivifies all that is in him and about him; his mind, his heart, his words, his actions; and thus he attains to the perfection of his state of self-surrender.

"Such, in a few words, is the faithful portraiture of the religious."

THE BURDEN OF THE TIME. Essays in Suggestion. Based upon certain of the Breviary Scriptures of the liturgical year. By *Rev. Cornelius Clifford*, Priest of the Diocese of Newark, author of "Introibo." 12mo., pp. xliii.—389. New York: Cathedral Library Association, 534 Amsterdam avenue.

In the present series of essays the author has gone once more for inspiration to the living liturgy of the Church. As in his former volume he sought to direct attention to the forgotten riches of the Sunday Introits, so in this his endeavor is to recall to the minds of his fellow-believers the profound suggestiveness for purposes of informal meditation of those Breviary Scriptures which the Roman See appoints for the consideration of her children, priest and layman alike, through all the weeks of the ecclesiastical year.

A glance at the substance of the reflections which the author has ventured provisionally to draw out in this direction will do more, perhaps, to explain his point of view than a detailed exposition by way of foreword could accomplish. He has approached these extracts, therefore—the *lectiones de Scriptura occurrente*—with the limitations of a homilete. Questions of criticism have not immediately concerned him. He has written in the spirit in which the Breviary was slowly compiled—the spirit of faith and enthusiasm for the most helpful portions of the Word of God and with a mind intent only on applying their present significance to latter-day Catholics. He has not aspired to logical completeness; much less has he pretended to exhaust the text. He has merely selected a few of the more striking utterances from each week's portion and discussed them according to his bent.

In the application which he has made of Scripture to present needs and problems the author has only had recourse to that chastened liberty of exegesis which is part of the constructive tradition of the Breviary itself. He has held preferably to the literal sense of passages wherever he could; but it will be seen that he has not been deaf to the deeper poetry of a more spiritual interpretation. The author has stated his purpose and plan so clearly that we shall not attempt to add anything except to say that he does not depart from them. Those who have seen the author's previous work, which attracted so much favorable attention as soon as it appeared, will not need any recommendation for its successor.

Summula Philosophiae Scholasticae in usum adolescentium Seminarii. B. Mariæ de Monte Melleario. Vol. II., Cosmologia et Psychologia. Dublinii: Browne et Nolan, 1904. Pp. vi.—423.

The field is already so well covered with manuals of scholastic philosophy that one can hardly expect to present a new claimant to attention without confronting the question *cui bono?* Books of this class seem to be all pretty much the same both in contents and form. Why then multiply them so persistently? That some minor variation in detail or in mode of presentation may adapt one such book more closely to the needs or tastes of an individual professor than does another seems no adequate ground for claiming a wider lien on precious time and energy. To some extent this point of view is justified, and yet a closer study of the successively appearing manuals will usually show that each has a more potent *raison d'être* than appears at first sight. This will be obvious to any competent student or professor who will take the time to examine

carefully the modestly entitled *Summula* at hand. Though composed primarily, as its name indicates, for the use of the students at Mount Mellary, Ireland, it will serve the purpose of text-book or reference manual in any seminary or college wherein a course of two years philosophy is pursued. Its adaptability in this connection lies first in the fact that it puts within moderate compass the sum total of scholastic philosophy, avoiding the meagreness and probable obscurity of the mere synopsis or compendium on the one hand and the discursiveness of the voluminous cursus on the other. The author has drawn the essentials from the master works—St. Thomas, Suarez, Urrabuni, Pesch and the rest—and has succeeded in presenting them with singular lucidity. In the second place he places scholasticism *en rapport* with modern forms of thought and expression. This excellent feature has been noticed as characterizing the preceding volume on "Logic and Ontology." It is, if anything, more apparent in the treatment of cosmology and psychology in the volume before us. It may safely be said that it is the only work of its class that brings the philosophy of the schools conveyed through a Latin medium into so full a relationship with the pertinent literature in English. For these two reasons especially the work merits the attention of all who have an interest in philosophy.

THE DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. Intended specially for priests and candidates for the priesthood. By *Rev. H. Noldin, S. J.* Authorized and translated from the German. Revised by the Rev. W. H. Kent, O. S. C. 12mo., pp. 272. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Father Noldin tells us that he has written this book out of the abundance of his own heart, and that is certainly the best recommendation that a book of devotion can have. It is a hard task, indeed, to beget devotion in others which we do not feel ourselves. But if we have devotion, and if the mouth speaks out of the abundance of the heart, then the words, whether written or spoken, should bear fruit a hundred fold. The author says:

"Ever since I was placed by my superiors at the head of the theological seminary at Innsbrück it has been my firm persuasion that the blessing of God which rests upon it is proportioned to and goes hand in hand with the zeal wherewith the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus is promoted and practised in that institute. And with no less certitude have I told myself that the candidate for priesthood who knows and practises this devotion will assuredly acquire the sacerdotal spirit and the virtues proper to a priest in preparation for receiving holy orders, and that it will also furnish

him with a sure means of maintaining and preserving the spirit of his sacred calling unto his life's end.

"It has, therefore, been my constant endeavor to make the alumni committed to my charge acquainted with the devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, to inspire them with love for it and to keep their ardor for a devotion so rich in graces alive and in active operation. All that I have recommended to them and earnestly impressed upon them with this object I have collected and arranged as a whole in the book now laid before the reader. The end proposed in its compilation will be fully attained should this little book conduce in any degree to awaken, to foster, to promote among those for whom it is intended more especially a devotion fraught with such abundant blessings."

The book is intended primarily for priests and ecclesiastical students, and therefore should do most good, for from them the devotion will spread to the people.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW IN THE UNITED STATES. By *Emlin McClain, L. L. D.*, Justice of the Supreme Court of Iowa. 12mo., pp. xxxviii.—438. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

In preparation of a book intended to give to non-professional students an intelligent conception of the constitutional law of the United States, both State and Federal, it is essential that the historical development of those institutions and ideas of government which have become characteristic features of our system be noticed, that the practical organization of the government as provided for be explained and that the interpretation which has been put upon the provisions of constitutional instruments in the solution of difficult and important questions which have arisen shall be stated; and it is especially important that the proper relationship between these various divisions of the subject shall be maintained.

This book is not, on the one hand, a theoretical exposition of the general principles of government, nor on the other a mere description of the workings of the State and Federal Governments and their various departments. But, as its title imports, so far as accomplishment corresponds to the purpose, it is an exposition of the principles of an established system; and it is intended to afford to the reader an explanation of the important events of the history of our government, and means of intelligently comprehending the problems constantly arising, the solution of which will make our constitutional history of the future. In short, if the book serves its purpose it will enable the person who intelligently uses it to reach

a rational and correct conception of the nature and meaning of the Constitutions of the United States and of his State, and to understand the essential features of the governments provided for by such Constitutions.

The main divisions of the book are: Part I., "System of Government;" Part II., "Organization of Government;" Part III., "Legislation;" Part IV., "Executive Power;" Part V., "The Judiciary;" Part VI., "The States and Territories;" Part VII., "Relations of the Individual to the Government;" Part VIII., "Civil Rights."

LETTERS OF BLESSED JOHN OF AVILA. Translated and selected from the Spanish by the *Benedictines of Stanbrook.* With preface by the Right Rev. Abbot Gasquet, O. S. B. 12mo., pp. 168. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This little volume contains the translation from the Spanish of a few spiritual letters of Blessed John of Avila. The author is probably not much known to English readers; certainly he is not as well known as he deserves to be both for his own merits as a writer and because in his own time, the sixteenth century, and even beyond the limits of his own country, Spain, he was a man of great renown. He was recognized everywhere as a special servant of God and as a true director of all souls desiring to walk the higher paths of perfection, or of those who needed help and encouragement to serve God in the humbler walks of life. He was also a preacher of exceptional power. St. Francis of Sales, in his "Practice of the Love of God," speaks of him as "the learned and saintly preacher of Andalusia," St. Francis Borgia as "the great master," and he was popularly known as the "Apostle of Andalusia" from the wonderful change which his preaching wrought in that district of Spain. His discourses were likened to "fishermen's nets gathering in fishes of all sorts" whenever and wheresoever he cast them, so plentiful was the harvest of souls which followed his exposition of the Christian teaching.

The letters begin with one to St. Teresa, discussing her account of her spiritual life, and followed by twenty-four addressed to others in various stations of life and standing in need of spiritual direction or consolation. They all indicate the deeply spiritual man with that keen insight into men's souls which only the holiest servants of God possess.

THE LEGAL TENDER PROBLEM. By *Percy Kinnaird,* of the Nashville Bar. 12mo., pp. 335. Chicago: Ainsworth & Co.

The economic, social and political life of man is determined by the method of procedure adopted by the Government for the pro-

duction of commodities and by the method of procedure adopted for the distribution or dispersal of the surplus commodities among the people. The method of procedure of commodities is very easily arranged, and the arrangement is simplified by allowing every one to choose any profession or follow any pursuit that his taste, inclination and means may prompt.

This liberty of action may be termed Individualism, Industrial Freedom or Liberalism, and is the generally accepted method in all civilized countries. While theoretically this is true, it is evident that equality of right and opportunity is not secured to the individual in practice. The cause which operates to withhold equality of right and opportunity in practice from the many, in both the creation and exchange of products, notwithstanding they may have said equality in theory, may be found in the method of procedure adopted for the distribution or exchange of products. Hence the "Legal Tender Problem," which Mr. Kinnaird treats in this volume at great length, and evidently intends to continue on some future occasion, for we notice the announcement at the close that this is the end of Volume I.

We respectfully suggest to the publishers that something should be said in the introduction about the extent of the work, because the purchaser may easily be led to think that it is complete in one volume.

THE SACRED HYMNS (Gl' Inni Sacri) AND THE NAPOLEONIC ODE (Il Cinque Maggio) OF ALEXANDER MANZONI. Translated in English rhyme, with portrait, biographical preface, historical introductions, critical notes and appendix containing the Italian texts, by *Rev. Joel Foote Bingham, D. D., L. H. D.* Crown, 8vo., cloth, gilt top, $3.00 net. New York: Oxford University Press.

The universal admiration of the literary world for Alexander Manzoni, whom it looks up to as a star in the galaxy of Italian letters second in brilliancy to Dante Alighieri only, will go out to this rendering in English of his "Sacred Hymns and the Napoleonic Ode." A well-known critic has said of Manzoni:

"Great as a poet, equally great as a prose writer, in thought, in feeling, in a sculpturesque style, he marked out deeply a new path in every kind of literature, historical, critical, philosophical, philological. His lyric poetry, his tragedies (in which he initiated reforms which are to-day the hinge of the modern drama) and the wonderful romance, 'I Promessi Sposi,' are monuments from which issue beams of light that penetrate every mind and every heart."

The translator says:

"In the succeeding translations I have aimed at the following

points: First of all and above all, to give the exact sense of the author down to the finest shade of meaning, to the utmost degree that lay in my power in the use of our tongue. The number of verses in the several stanzas, though a matter, I suppose, of no great importance, is in fact the same as in the original or varies from it but seldom."

HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF THE PHILADELPHIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF ST. CHARLES BORROMEO. 1832-1905. By *Rev. A. J. Schulte.* 8vo., pp. 125. Illustrated. Overbrook: St. Charles' Seminary.

For a long time there has been an urgent demand for a second edition of Father Schulte's excellent "Historical Sketch of St. Charles' Seminary," and for two reasons: because it was out of print, and because of the valuable information which it contains and which cannot be found anywhere else without much labor.

St. Charles' Seminary has led such a peaceful life that only those who have been connected with it realize the important place which it occupies in the history of the Church in this country. Modesty is a characteristic of Philadelphia, and the Catholic Church of Philadelphia shows this characteristic in an eminent degree. If we were more boastful the history of our Seminary would be written on a thousand pages instead of a hundred. But we are proud of the hundred in a lawful way, for the lists of presidents, rectors, professors and alumni are long and honorable.

These tables are invaluable, and the future historian will bless the memory of the humble author who faithfully compiled them without claiming the small reward of a place for his name on the title page. Though brief, the sketch is complete and interesting. The illustrations are well chosen and well executed. Not only the graduates of St. Charles' Seminary, but all students of history should have the book and preserve it.

GESCHICHTE DER WELTLITERATUR. Von *Alexander Baumgartner, S. J.* Band V. Die franzoesische Literatur. Herder: Freibug and St. Louis. Price, $4.25, net.

In a beautiful volume of over seven hundred pages Father Baumgartner surveys the wide field of French literature from its earliest beginnings to the present day. It was natural to begin the history of recent literature with the French, as their language and literature was the first in order of time to develop among the modern nations of Europe and long dominated the others. That Father Baumgartner has done the work well it is useless to say to those who

have studied the four preceding tomes. He has divided the work into three books. In the first he traces the development of French language and literature during the Middle Ages. The second deals with the golden days of the French classics in the seventeenth century and the subsequent decay during the period of the temporary triumph of infidelity. The third book treats of French literary efforts during the nineteenth century. As the learned author wastes no time wtih irrelevant or platitudinous generalizations and philosophizings, the usual bane of such writings, he is enabled to give a satisfactory and always true and judicious appreciation of each of the prominent French writers, and in consequence the work is equally instructive and entertaining. We look forward with interest to the succeeding volumes.

THE FEASTS OF MOTHER CHURCH, With Hints and Helps for Holier Keeping of Them. By *Mother M. Salome*, St. Mary's Convent, The Bar, York. 12mo., pp. 269.

"In the Catholic Church is a garden enclosed and flowing with delights. Color and fragrance pulsate perennially behind the encircling wall; freshness and life stream upwards unceasingly from the glowing beds. It is a 'feast-garden,' and holy days are its flowers.

"Alas! through running after the unsatisfying excitements provided in the world's garden many Catholics would seem to have lost the key to this one and its heart-stirring treasures. The lost key will be found in these plain, direct and chatty papers. We anticipate that Mother M. Salome's 'Hints and Helps' will shed life and fragrance on the daily life of many a Catholic. Her book is a praiseworthy attempt to revive a taste for those powerful yet too often neglected aids to practical and joyous religion, the 'Feasts of Mother Church.'"

The book is made up of a collection of meditations or reflections on the feasts without any pretense to learning or exhaustiveness. It will serve best the humble, pious soul who accepts help in any form with gratitude.

PASTORAL MEDICINE. A Hand-book for the Catholic Clergy. By *Alexander E. Sanford, M. D.* 12mo., pp. 234. New York: Joseph L.Wagner.

"The purpose of 'Pastoral Medicine' is to present to the practical theologian facts of physical science, as developed by the medical profession, for the purpose of applying them in pastoral functions and in explanation and support of the teachings of faith and morals.

'Pastoral Medicine' has for its object the treatment of some branches of the scope of pastoral labors, which, as a rule, are but sparingly, if at all, included in the clerical student's plan of studies."

The author writes clearly and covers a very large field in comparatively small space. We fear that some critics will say that proper judgment was not used in dividing this space. For instance, sixty-four pages are given to "Hygiene" and only a little over three pages to "Procuratio Abortus," while "Craniotomy" is not noticed at all. And yet within a week the writer of this notice has seen a petition signed by all the Catholic students of a large medical school, and addressed to an ecclesiastical superior, complaining that they cannot get unity of direction from their confessors on these subjects, and asking for the authoritative teaching of the Church. These and kindred subjects which stand midway between theology and medicine and which effect both body and soul are the questions that are burning. If some one will answer them in brief form, but accurately, so that a copy of the answers can be placed in the hands of every Catholic medical student and physician in the country he will become a public benefactor.

ACTA INEDITA HISTORIAM PONTIFICUM ROMANORUM PRAESERTIM SAEC. XV., XVI., XVII., Illustrantia. Edidit *Ludivicus Pastor.* Vol. I.: 1376-1464. Sumptibus Herder. Price, $2.85.

With this volume Dr. Pastor begins to redeem a promise made eighteen years ago, namely, to collect and publish the numerous documents relating to the Popes of the Renaissance and Reformation periods still lurking in the various archives of Italy, as an appendix to his valuable "History of the Popes." It is a publication quite indispensable to those who wish to control the statements of historical writers by a reference to the original founts of information. We rejoice to see it stated in the public press that the long-awaited fourth volume of Pastor's Popes will be issued during the course of the present year. We have often regretted that the time of this great historian should have been spent on other tasks. Surely his "History of the Popes" is the all-sufficient work of a single life. To this monumental labor he ought to have consecrated his undivided energies.

PRAYERS AND MEDITATIONS ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By *Thomas Haemerken à Kempis.* Translated from the text of edition of Michael Joseph Pohl by W. Duthoit, D. C. St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, $1.35.

This is a very acceptable addition to our devotional literature. A practical experience of some months has convinced us that the

"Meditations" of the pious author of the "Imitation" are not only an excellent book for one's private devotions, but that they are also wonderfully appropriate for readings to the faithful after the morning's Mass. This is particularly true of the meditations on Our Lord's Passion, which may be read on the mornings of Lent with great profit to the people. They are concise and pithy, and present à Kempis at his best. We may remark, by the way, that Dr. Pohl's beautiful edition of the opera omnia of Thomas à Kempis has now reached its sixth and penultimate volume.

THE LITTLE FLOWERS OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. With eight illustrations. By *Paul Woodroffe*. 12mo., pp. viii.—277. London: Kegan Paul, etc.

This edition of the Fioretti is based by permission upon the translation issued by the Franciscan Fathers at Upton, which has been for some time out of print. It has been carefully revised by Mr. Thomas Okey, and when necessary has been brought into closer accordance with the Italian, care having been taken to preserve as much as possible the simplicity of the original. The present publishers are enabled to avail themselves of so scholarly a rendering by the courtesy of the Catholic Truth Society, under whose auspices it first appeared. The compiler of the Fioretti is unknown, but the work is supposed to date from the middle of the fourteenth century.

DIE PARABELN DES HERRN IM EVANGELIUM exegetisch und praktisch erlaeutert. Von *Leopold Fonck, S. J.* Zweite, vielfach verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Innsbruck and New York: Pustet.

The first edition of Professor Fonck's "Parables of Our Lord" was exhausted immediately upon the appearance of the work, the best proof of its excellence. The improvements introduced into the second edition are not very important, so little did it stand in need of revision. We recommend the book most warmly to students, and especially to preachers of the Divine Word. Since the bulk of Our Saviour's message was delivered to the multitudes in parables, it is clearly the duty of His ministers to penetrate their meaning; and this is by no means an easy task.

STUDIES IN RELIGION AND LITERATURE. By *William Samuel Lilly*. St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, $3.25, net.

Under this vague caption Mr. Lilly has gathered together nine essays published at different times and in various periodicals. They

are miscellaneous in character, but all, like everything which proceeds from this author's veteran pen, extremely interesting and instructive. No Catholic writer in the English literary world can compare with Mr. Lilly in the influence which he exerts upon the thinking non-Catholic public, and although we cannot always agree with him in his estimate of men and events, yet we feel throughout his writings the spirit of one who is a sincere Catholic at heart and who is actuated by the highest and purest motives.

PSALLITE SAPIENTER. Erklaerung der Psalmen im Geiste des betrachtenden Gebets und der Liturgie. Von *Dr. Maurus Wolter, O. S. B.* Freiburg and St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, $2.75, net.

It speaks volumes for the intelligent piety of the clergy and educated laity of Germany that this noble work on the Psalms has reached a third edition. It is just the book one needs for the interpretation of this difficult portion of Sacred Scripture. It is, first of all, the life-work of a very saintly monk, the outpouring of a heart filled with love of God. The ascetical so predominates throughout one forgets at first to observe the vast amount of accurate critical erudition which it contains. The priest who reads his psalter day by day will discover unthought of wealth of meaning in the Psalms of his Divine Office.

SKETCHES FOR SERMONS, chiefly on the Gospels, for the Sundays and holy days of the year. By *Rev. R. K. Wakeham, S. S.*, St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y. 8vo., pp. 229. New York: Joseph L. Wagner.

Had the writing of the "Sketches or Suggestions for Sermons for the Sundays and Holy Days of the Year" depended upon the author's own initiative, or upon his belief that he could fill a want long felt, they would surely never have appeared in print. It was in response to a special request that the task was undertaken; and it may be truly affirmed that neither the desire to oblige nor any prospect of personal advantage resulting from the work would have been a sufficient inducement to accede to the request, had the writer not indulged the hope that he might be able to render a real service to his busy brother priests, at least to those just entering the field of their missionary labors and assuming the great responsibility of "preaching the Word."

OFFICIUM HEBDOMADAE MAIORIS, a Dominica in Palmis usque ad Sabbatum in albis, iuxta Ordinem Brevionii, Missalis et Pontificalis Romani editum. 12mo., pp. 420. Neo Eboraci: Fr. Pustet.

This is a most attractive edition of the Office for the two weeks

beginning with Palm Sunday and ending with Low Sunday, and including the Masses for the whole period. It resembles in size and general make-up the smaller Votive Office Book, with type like the larger one. A special feature is an appendix containing the Ordo of the Mass and commemorations of the feasts which occur during the period covered by the book, so that with this book in hand a priest is equipped for the two weeks without necessity for any references. It is the most attractive and convenient Holy Week for priests that we have seen, and it is sure to meet with popular favor.

LATEST PUBLICATIONS OF GINN & CO., BOSTON, NEW YORK, CHICAGO AND LONDON:

A SHORT HISTORY OF ENGLAND. By *Edward P. Cheyney.* 12mo., cloth, pp. 625. Illustrated. List price, $1.35; mailing price, $1.40.

This "Short History of England" is about midway in length between the shorter school histories and the longer works which are of value chiefly to advanced students or as books of reference. It is admirably adapted for use in colleges and in high schools that offer a rather complete course in English history. A great many persons and a great many events often included in text-books have been omitted in order that those which are more significant can be given enough space and attention to show their real character and importance. For the same reason less attention has been given to military than to civil history. For instance, the space given to the Wars of the Roses has been reduced as much as possible in order to give sufficient emphasis to the Reformation.

The book has been illustrated with about one hundred and fifty original pen drawings of contemporary objects by competent artists. Bibliographical references to primary and secondary sources are given at the close of each chapter.

The book is written in an easy pleasant style and is most attractively made, but it is not written from a Catholic point of view, although the author seems to be without prejudice.

STORM'S IN ST. JÜRGEN. Edited, with introduction, notes, vocabulary and English exercises, by *J. H. Beckmann*, Teacher of German in the Lincoln (Neb.) High School. International Modern Language Series. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth. Portrait. List price, 35 cents; mailing price, 40 cents.

Theodore Storm's chief claim upon posterity undoubtedly rests in the simple lyric poems which are filled with the atmosphere and charm of his North German home. But in the tender realism of "In St. Jürgen" even more than in the haunting melancholy of his

"Immensee" is to be found a truth and beauty too near to real life ever to be passed by unnoticed. Certain of Storm's shorter stories are veiled with romantic sentiment, but the fresh and out-of-door environment of "In St. Jürgen" is like a breath from one of his beloved northern moors.

In this new volume in the International Modern Language Series is presented an excellent lesson of how environment influences human life. The tone of the story is sweet, although somewhat sad and melancholy, and cannot fail to hold the pupil's interest from beginning to end. The notes of the book are limited to proper explanations and are brief and to the point. There are included a number of exercises for retranslation which it is hoped will prove a useful addition to the text. The book is well adapted for use in the second year of the high school or in first year college classes.

LA MERE DE LA MARQUISE and LA FILLE DU CHANOINE. By *Edmond About.* International Modern Language Series. Edited, with notes and vocabulary, by O. B. Super, Professor of Romance Languages in Dickinson College. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth, 227 pages, with frontispiece. List price, 50 cents; mailing price, 55 cents.

Few French writers of fiction are more widely known than Edmond About, and none more richly deserves popularity. His writings contain a humor which makes them entertaining reading, and a skill in the delineation of character inferior only to that of the great Balzac. They are particularly noteworthy on account of the absence of those features which make much French fiction inappropriate for use in the class room. The style is not difficult, and the notes and vocabulary are of such fulness that the book may be used during the first year's work by any excepting very young students. For these it will be more suitable if used in the second year. Even mature students, however, will find it useful and interesting for rapid reading.

FLACHSMANN ALS ERZIEHER. By *Otto Ernst.* International Modern Language Series. Edited, with introduction and notes, by Elizabeth Kingsbury, Teacher of German in Lincoln Academy, Lincoln, Neb. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth, 190 pages. Portrait. List price, 40 cents; mailing price, 45 cents.

This popular German comedy, which has reached its fifteenth thousand in Germany, gives a true view of the German public school system of to-day. The style is that of the modern realistic school, though entirely free from objectionable features. The atmosphere of modern Germany pervades the play. The language is conversational throughout and offers the student excellent drill in idioms

of everyday speech. The notes are copious enough to elucidate historical, biographical, provincial and idiomatic expressions, as well as the more difficult points in grammar. A brief account of the author's life precedes the text. The book may be used to best advantage in the second or third year of the study of German.

SOME SUCCESSFUL AMERICANS. By *Sherman Williams*, New York State Institute Conductor, and formerly Superintendent of Schools at Glens Falls, N. Y. 12mo., cloth, 194 pages. Illustrated. List price, 50 cents; mailing price, 55 cents.

This book is intended for supplementary reading in the sixth, seventh and eighth grades. It contains sketches of the lives of many famous Americans who achieved success in the face of what are generally called adverse conditions. Abraham Lincoln, Louisa Alcott, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Mary Lyon, Peter Cooper and Horace Greeley are among those taken as examples. Both men and women are included and they have been chosen so as to represent different callings and various sections of the country and thus interest the largest number of pupils.

ZSCHOKKE, DER ZERBROCHENE KRUG. Edited, with introduction, notes and vocabulary, by *Herbert Charles Sanborn*, Head Instructor in German in the Bancroft School, Worcester, Mass. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth, xvi.+76 pages, with frontispiece. List price, 25 cents; mailing price, 30 cents.

This popular little story, so characteristic of the narrative style of its author, is peculiarly well adapted, on account of the simplicity of its style and diction, for classes of beginners in German. The present edition has accordingly been carefully prepared to meet the needs of this grade of readers. The story itself has always been a favorite with young people, and its interest is enhanced by flashes of that pure humor in which Zschokke excelled.

ELEMENTS OF BOTANY, with Key and Flora. Revised Edition. By *Joseph Y. Bergen*, formerly Instructor in Biology, English High School, Boston. Cloth, 12mo., 283+257 pages. Illustrated. List price, $1.30; mailing price, $1.45.

Bergen's "Elements of Botany," revised edition, is designed to furnish a half-year course in the subject for students in secondary schools. It covers all the ground which ordinary classes can traverse in the time indicated, and endeavors to present only those topics which are essential to an elementary course in the science.

It differs from the earlier editions of the "Elements" mainly in the greater stress laid on the topics of œcology and cryptogamic botany, in the somewhat abbreviated directions for histological work on seed plants, and in the greatly improved quality of the illustrations. Minor changes will be found on almost every page.

DIE JOURNALISTEN. By *Gustav Freytag.* Edited, with brief biographical introduction, notes and complete vocabulary, by Leigh R. Gregor, Lecturer on Modern Languages in McGill University, Montreal, Canada. International Modern Language Series. 16mo., semi-flexible cloth, 231 pages. Portrait. List price, 45 cents; mailing price, 50 cents.

"Die Journalisten" is the best comedy which Germany has produced since "Minna von Barnhelm," and is recommended by the Committee of Twelve as "suitable reading matter for the third year." It gives a picture of German political and social life about 1850, which in the main is applicable to the Germany of to-day. In Mr. Gregor's edition there is commentary of the usual sort, and the annotations also include descriptions of usages and characteristic national features alluded to in the play.

ELEMENTARY WOODWORKING. By *Edwin W. Foster,* Instructor in Shopwork and Drawing in the Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.; graduate of the Sloyd Seminary, Nääs, Sweden; formerly Supervisor of Manual Training, Utica, N. Y. 12mo., cloth, 133 pages. Illustrated. List price, 75 cents; mailing price, 80 cents.

This book is especially designed to meet modern conditions. It is to be placed in the hands of the student to reinforce the oral instruction and demonstration in the higher grammar grades and in the first years of the high school. The work is divided into two parts. The book is profusely illustrated with pictures and diagrams showing the proper use of tools and the action of their various parts.

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA.

English-speaking Catholics the world over will hail with delight the news that a great Catholic encyclopedia in the English language is soon to become an actuality. The publication of such a work has long been talked about. Its needs and advantages are an old story long discussed and long wished for. It has at last got beyond that stage and is about to become a realization. Arrangements have now been completed in New York city for that purpose, its board of

editors formed and a publishing company established and incorporated to undertake it.

The board of editors of the Catholic Encyclopedia consists of: Charles George Herbermann, Ph. D., LL. D., professor of the Latin language in the College of the City of New York, editor-in-chief; Edward Aloysius Pace, Ph. D., D. D., professor of philosophy in the Catholic University of America; Conde Benoist Pallen, Ph. D., LL. D., managing editor; Thomas Joseph Shahan, J. U. L., D. D., professor of church history in the Catholic University of America; John J. Wynne, S. J., editor of the *Messenger*.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE LIGHT OF FAITH. A Defense, in Brief, of Fundamental Truths. By *Frank McGloin*. St. Louis: Herder. Price, $1.00 net.

WITHIN AND WITHOUT THE CHURCH. By *Rev. J. Laxenaire*. Adapted from the French by Rev. J. M. Leleu. St. Louis: B. Herder. Price, 30 cents.

JESUS CHRIST THE WORD INCARNATE. Considerations gathered from the works of the Angelic Dictor, St. Thomas Aquinas. By *Roger Freddi, S. J.* Translated from the Italian by F. J. Sullivan, S. J. Published by B. Herder, St. Louis. Price, $1.25, net.

GENESIS UND KEILSCHRIFTFORSCHUNG. Ein Beitrag zum Verstaendnis der biblischen Ur- und Patriarchengeschichte. Von *Dr. Johannes Nikel*. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, $1.75, net.

DIE MODERNE BIOLOGIE UND DIE ENTWICKLUNGSTHEORIE. Von *Erich Wasmann, S. J.* Zweite vermehrte Auflage. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, $1.75, net.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CARDINAL WISEMAN. By *Wilfrid Ward*. 2 vols., 8vo., pp. 579 and 656. New edition at reduced price without change of text. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

THE STORY OF THE CONGO FREE STATE. Social, political and economic aspect of the Belgian system of government in Central Africa. By *Henry Wellington Wack, F. R. G. S.* (member of New York Bar). With 125 illustrations and maps. 8vo., pp. xv.—634. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

THE GENTLE SHAKESPEARE. A Vindication. By *John Pym Yeatman*, of Lincoln's Inn, Esquire, etc.; Honorary Member of the Shakespeare Society of New York, etc. Third edition (augmented). Large 8vo., pp. 405. New York: The Shakespeare Press. Birmingham: Moody Brothers.

SERMONS PREACHED IN ST. EDMUND'S COLLEGE CHAPEL ON VARIOUS OCCASIONS. With an introduction by the Most Rev. Francis Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster. Collected and arranged by Edwin Burton, Vice President. 12mo., pp. 249. New York: Benziger Brothers.

SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY. By the *Right Rev. William Stang, D. D.*, Bishop of Fall River. 12mo., pp. 207. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE CHURCH OF GOD ON TRIAL BEFORE THE TRIBUNAL OF REASON. By *Edward J. Maginnis*, of the Schuylkill County Bar, Pa. 12mo., pp. 248. New York: Christian Press Association.

THE SAINTS. ST. PETER FOURIER. By *L. Pingand*. Translated by C. W. W. 12mo., pp. 194. London: Duckworth & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

THE LIFE OF ST. PATRICK, APOSTLE OF IRELAND. By *William Canon Fleming*, Rector of St. Mary's, Moorfields, London. 12mo., pp. 178. New York: Benziger Brothers.